Corvus

MMXX-MMXXI

VOLUME XI

CORVUS

THE JOURNAL OF THE CARLETON
UNIVERSITY CLASSICS SOCIETY

Volume 11

2020-2021

ISSN 2369-9086 (Print)
ISSN 2369-9094 (Online)

PUBLISHED BY THE CARLETON
UNIVERSITY CLASSICS SOCIETY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORS

Editor-in-Chief

NIĠEL KLEMENČIČ-PUGLISEVICH is in his third-year at Carleton University, working towards his BA (Hons.) in Greek & Roman Studies and History with minors in Archaeology and Medieval & Early Modern Studies. He is particularly interested in medieval Islamic Malta, archival archaeology, and decolonizing museums. He plans to pursue a Master's degree in History or Archaeology and to continue his career in the museum industry, both in Canada and in Malta. This is his second year editing for Corvus.

Editors

CHRIS AUBIN is a fourth-year Greek and Roman Studies major, pursuing a minor in Archaeology who will be completing their undergraduate degree with honours at Carleton this year. Following their graduation, they hope they can pursue further education and possibly enter into a career in Archaeology!

ELOISE GREENFIELD is a Carleton University student majoring in Greek and Roman Studies & History. Her areas of interest include ancient Greek literature, specifically epic poetry and tragedy, as well as oral history. Despite her very real and very serious fear of owls, she has a particular interest in the city of Athens during the Hellenistic period.

NICOLETTA OWENS is a second-year English student who has a concentration in Drama Studies and a minor in Medieval and Early Modern Studies. She has an interest in the presence and representation of women in literature throughout history, including ancient Greek drama. She has written a handful of reviews, mainly for theatre productions, but has an interest in editing papers and articles. This is her first time editing for Corvus and she is very excited about the opportunity!

MARTINA PETERSON is Martina is in her third year of a BA in Linguistics at Carleton. She's always had an interest in language history and evolution, and she fell in love with Latin when she studied it in her first year. She is excited to be working on the Corvus Classics Journal as she wants to pursue a career in publishing after completing her degree. In her spare time, Martina loves to sew, read, and spend time in nature.

CONTRIBUTORS

JULIA BOVAIRD third-year undergraduate student at Carleton University majoring in both anthropology and art history. As such, she is interested primarily in the art and architecture of antiquity, their cultural contexts, and how they continue to be represented in modern aesthetic practices. Julia works as a Teaching Assistant for a course on ancient science and technology and has been awarded the Jack Barwick and Douglas Duncan Memorial Scholarship for Art History for her academic performance and research.

DANKA DAVIDOVIĆ is a fourth-year student completing a Combined Honours degree in History and Greek and Roman Studies. She will be pursuing a Master of Information Studies degree in the fall. Her area of interest is ancient Greek history, though she thoroughly enjoys studying all ancient civilizations. This is her second Corvus publication, and she has an upcoming publication in Western University's undergraduate journal, The Mirror, as well.

KATHLEEN DEAN is a fourth-year undergraduate at Carleton University majoring in Greek and Roman Studies with a minor in Japanese. She became interested in Greek history as a child while reading children's Greek mythology books such as *Phone Home, Persephone*. It is because of this interest as a child that she has focused her studies on the mythology and religion part of other cultures. She is interested in continuing her studies and going for her Master's in the future.

COLLEEN DUNN spent almost forty years in pediatric radiography and ultrasonography and entered university as a retiree. She is now in fourth year working part-time on a degree in Greek and Roman Studies and Religion. The vast majority of her poems are inspired by the intriguing topics covered in classes. Colleen commends her fellow students on their focus and determination in pursuing their scholastic goals during the challenges of these pandemic times. She is also very grateful to the staff and faculty of Carleton University for the competent and dedicated manner in which they have made it possible for students to continue their studies from home.

MAYA MAAYERGI is a fourth-year undergraduate history major. Her primary interest in classics is the study of Ancient Rome. In elementary school she was fortunate enough to participate in a play about the Roman empire, where she played a Roman soldier, and since then has always found the topic highly interesting. Her first course in the classics department at Carleton was History of Ancient Rome with Dr. Pettipiece, which was a fascinating class. This is her first published paper.

KYLE SCARLETT is a fourth-year history student finishing his undergraduate degree at Carleton University. Having spent time in the history programs at both Carleton and the University of Toronto he has finally managed to settle down and focus on finishing his degree. His interests lay primarily in the evolution of ecclesiastical institutions and worship practices observed by common folk in both the Roman republican and Frankish Carolingian periods. He hopes to transition from his undergrad into the realm of teaching, with hopes of inspiring the next generation of future historians!

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

I am so proud of this edition of Corvus. This year has been a challenge for everybody, but we were supported by such a strong team of editors and contributors that made this edition possible. I want to start by thanking everybody who participated this year. It has not been easy and projects such as this require additional screentime and responsibilities from many of us who have been dealing with difficulties and additional challenges this past year. Thank you for taking the time to showcase the incredible research and writing of the undergraduate students in the eleventh edition of Corvus.

I would also like to give a special thank you to Dr. Elizabeth Kennedy-Klaassen, Dr. Shane Hawkins, and Andrea McIntyre from the College of the Humanities at Carleton University for their contributions in helping to ensure that Corvus has been kept active and for spreading the word about the call for papers and editors. I would like to also thank the incredible efforts of all the Greek & Roman Studies faculty members at Carleton University for their endless encouragement of their students—without them, Corvus would not be possible. Thank you additionally to Brooke MacArthur (Editor-in-Chief 2019/2020) for her advice and support of this year's publication.

It is the goal of Corvus to exhibit the work and research of undergraduate students in the field of Greek & Roman Studies. With all the hard work of everybody involved, I believe we succeeded in celebrating that work. I would like to encourage anybody interested in getting involved with Corvus to please reach out, we would love to hear from you.

NIĠEL KLEMENČIČ-PUGLISEVICH

An Exploration of the Venus Pudica Type in Art History

Julia Bovaird

Abstract

Many artistic depictions of the ancient goddess Aphrodite or Venus conform to a typified pose known as the Venus pudica. This nude figure type is not limited to antiquity as the modest gesture was adopted by Renaissance artists for representations of the goddess and later for alternative characters. By analysing the formal characteristics of various pudica figures from antiquity, the Renaissance, and modernity, this paper examines the effects of her modesty and how this varies between works based on the context for which the figure was intended. This examination found the gesture to be inherently sexual, unlike the modesty designated by its title. Because the pudica posture has been further adapted for Christian and secular works, the extent to which this sexuality is true can be limited or augmented. The type is therefore largely bounded to its original pagan subject matter, and with its long-standing and well developed sexual undertones is not easily expandable beyond the ancient pagan goddess of love.

The *Venus pudica* pose, or the "modest Venus," has its origins in Classical Greek art. Praxiteles' famous Aphrodite of Cnidus sculpture is remarkable for many reasons. Carved in the mid-fourth century BCE, it was the first life-size female nude to follow centuries of clothed figures, allowing for future exploration of the female form

with typified postures.[1] Although the original sculpture has been lost, ancient texts and later sculptural copies provide us with information about the goddess's appearance. The Vatican's Venere Colonna (Figure 1) is commonly regarded as the most reliable copy of the Aphrodite of Cnidus.[2] From this copy and various texts, we can deduce that the Cnidian Aphrodite's right hand was posed in front of her pubic area while her breasts remained exposed. She stood in traditional contrapposto, leaning on her right leg as her balancing left arm rested on an adjacent structure and held her removed clothing. Her head turned slightly downward and to her right, and her hair was pulled back. The Parian marble figure earned its artist fame and served as a tourist destination at the Cnidian Temple of Aphrodite for centuries.[3] Its role as a cult statue reasserts the status of Aphrodite as a divine symbol of love, a fact which provides a justification for her nudity and emphasizes her sexuality. In this way, Praxiteles' characteristically Greek statue, innovative in subject matter but traditional in stance, inspired future artistic types that have persisted in various forms since their inception.

The Venus pudica gesture is among the many thematic variations on the Aphrodite of Cnidus that proliferated art in the following centuries. The most closely related example of this type is the Capitoline Venus (Figure 2), which so closely resembles the Cnidian Aphrodite of which it is considered to be an almost contemporary copy.[4] There is one significant

1 Christine Mitchell Havelock, *The Aphrodite of Knidos and Her Successors: A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995), 5.

2 Havelock, *The Aphrodite of Knidos,* 13.

3 Havelock, *The Aphrodite of Knidos,* 9.

4 "Statue of 'Capitoline Venus'," Musei Capitolini, accessed March 25, 2020, http://www.museicapitolini.org/en/collezioni/percorsi_per_sale/palazzo_nuovo/gabinetto_della_venere/statua_della_venere_capitolina.

formal difference, however, which distinguishes the pudica type from the Cnidian. Rather than only using one hand to shield her genitalia, the Capitoline Venus uses one hand each to cover her pubic region and her breasts, acting with the increased modesty that earned the pose its name. By almost all other characteristics the two statues remain similar, as both essentially nude pagan goddesses are in contrapposto stance and have draped their clothing over a neighbouring vase. Swiss art historian Johann Jakob Bernoulli interprets their postural difference to signify a shift in self-consciousness, where the idealized beauty of the Aphrodite of Cnidus conveys an innocent purity while the Capitoline goddess shows awareness of her indecent exposure.[5] In this way, the overt sexuality of the later sculpture is greater than that of the Praxitelean, and the hands which are intended to hide her body instead serve to draw attention to its pleasurable role in love. This is, of course, a suitable statement to be made in relation to the goddess of love and so the pudica gesture has continued to characterize many of her figural representations ever since its conception.

In a rare example of ancient sculpture with a known artist, the Medici Venus (Figure 3) is an additional example of the use of the pudica gesture in Greek antiquity. Cleomenes' second century BCE sculpture is strikingly similar to the Capitoline Venus and it thus becomes clear that they share inspirational roots in the Aphrodite of Cnidus. The covering gestures of the Medici figure's arms, the turn of her head, and her erect left leg are virtually identical to her other post-Praxitelean counterpart. The sculpture differs, however, in its adjacent support which includes two Erotes and a dolphin,

5 Havelock, *The Aphrodite of Knidos,* 70-71.

directly referencing Venus's birth from the sea.[6] Perhaps due to this allusion to her origin, the Medici figure seems to be slightly more open in her position and thus carries a confident sexuality that is absent from the Capitoline figure. Despite these differences in setting and self-assurance, her pudica pose has the same sexualizing effect as the Capitoline Venus and these adjustments serve to further justify the nudity through the increased allusion to her divine origins. Although the original purposes of the Capitoline and Medici Venuses remain unclear, their direct relation to the Cnidian Aphrodite and the time in which they were carved maintain their religious significance. This is perhaps the reason for the Medici figure's ongoing influence on art, as the subject has a more recognizable context and divinely reasoned nudity.

The Renaissance is characterized by an interest in the art of antiquity, and this did not exclude the Venus pudica figures. Sandro Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus* (1485) (Figure 4) features this figure type and is the "first monumental image since Roman times of the nude goddess in a pose derived from Classical statues of Venus."[7] Like the Medici Venus with which Botticelli would have been familiar, this work portrays Venus originating from the sea. Her Renaissance posture, however, seems more relaxed and dynamic, and her previously tied back idealized blonde hair now flows loosely to frame her flushed face. The ends of her hair are held by her right hand and accompany it in covering the pubic area, while her left hand is simultaneously pressed more firmly to her chest. This is also the first pudica with whom other figures interact, as Zephyr and Aura, representational of the

6 Christopher M. S. Johns, "The Conceptualization of Form and the Modern Sculptural Masterpiece: Canova's Drawings for 'Venus Italica'," *Master Drawings* 41, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 138.

7 H.W. Janson, *History of Art*, (New York City: Abrams Books, 1962), 470.

winds, blow her to shore and the Hora of spring moves to receive her with a cloak.[8] The sexual emphasis of the pose is heightened by her hair which draws focus to the pubic area, and is juxtaposed, but not outweighed, by both the motion to clothe the figure and the conceptual purity of birth.[9] Although the figures from antiquity are also inherently sexual, they were balanced by religious reasoning. It is true that this Venus is displayed in a religious context, but it is not the artist's own. The Renaissance artists, having no direct religious ties to Venus or Aphrodite, lost this sense of balance founded in religious belief and thus enabled her sexuality to eclipse her divine purity. Because the context for which artworks of Venus were made, they were no longer religious; the goddess's function as a symbol of love better served artistic expressions of idealized beauty and sexuality than worship and fertility.

As evidenced by Botticelli's Renaissance artwork, religion, or the diminution thereof, has the capacity to alter the interpretation of long-standing artistic types. The same is true for a rise in alternative religious practice, as seen through Masaccio's *Expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden* (1424-1427) (Figure 5), a work which completely abandoned the pudica type's ancient religious origins for adaptive use in Catholic imagery. This fresco belongs to a Christian context, and in the place of Venus the figure exhibiting the pudica gesture is Eve. She and Adam are in a situation very unlike the birth of Venus, depicted in the moments following their shameful expulsion from paradise as a result of their sins. Eve's facial expression is one of

8 "Birth of Venus," The Uffizi, accessed March 29, 2020, https://www.uffizi.it/en/artworks/birth-of-venus.

9 David Lang Clark, "Poliziano's *Kupris Anadyomene* and Botticelli's *Birth of Venus*," *Word and Image* 22, no. 4 (June 2012): 394.

agony and remorse as she is driven away by an angel, a direct opposition to the soft sensuality of her predecessors. She is depicted in mid-stride instead of standing in contrapposto, but the position of her arms conforms to historical examples. This position was undoubtedly derived, either directly or indirectly, from an ancient figure of the pudica type, perhaps through Giovanni Pisano's nude *Prudence* (1302-1310) found at the base of the Pisa Cathedral pulpit.[10] Although the overall position aligns with the established Venus pudica type, the subject matter of the fresco and Eve's expression of shame gives the pose an entirely different connotation. The originally titillating position is inverted "to one of truly shameful modesty" resulting from her temptation and sinfulness, a contrast indicated by her facial expression and the tight grasp of her chest which leaves both nipples concealed.[11] Unlike the previous examples which make no attempt to hide the breasts completely, Eve is successful in blocking them from view and thus removes this aspect of her sexuality from the artwork. It is this new Catholic context which removes the traditional sexuality of the pudica gesture. Eve does not serve the same purpose to Catholicism as do Venus and Aphrodite to the ancient religions and for this reason, her nudity does not have the same divine importance. The pose which had previously been used as a tool of seduction is instead used to display the shame of her actions. The emotionality and purpose of the subject matter, the punishment of sin and the fall of humankind, also deters viewers from interpreting any perceived sexuality. Religion, therefore, becomes a limiting factor in the preservation of the established meaning of the Venus pudica, as the sexuality of previous works is unconducive to Christian purposes and

10 Hellmut Wohl, "Masaccio," *Grove Art Online* (2003): 9.

11 James Clifton, "Gender and Shame in Masaccio's *Expulsion from the Garden of Eden*," *Art History* 22, no. 5 (December 1999): 641.

is eliminated from Masaccio's adaptation.

As the Renaissance era continued to advance, so too did their artistic interpretations of the ancient pose. Titian's *Venus of Urbino* (1538) (Figure 6) provides an example of the minor postural transformations that the Venus pudica underwent and is the first figure examined here who is reclined rather than standing. Having returned to an image of Venus from an example using the Christian Eve, we see a reclamation of the gesture's original overtones, even with its formal deviations from historical examples. She is the first of these examined artworks to directly engage with the viewer, and the second to leave her breasts exposed following only the Praxitelean original. Although the absence of an attempt to shield her breasts from view disqualifies her from being a genuine example of the Venus pudica, it can be argued that her gesture to cover her pubis alone is enough to provide the artwork with the type's characteristic effect. The figure herself carries resemblances to Botticelli's Venus but evokes a more tangible divinity through her presentation as a young 16th-century bride.[12] Titian did indeed take inspiration from traditional Venus pudica depictions but adapted it to fit the sexual allure of a contemporary marriage ritual. Her mythological identity is preserved through the presence of Venus's common symbols, including the roses at her right hand and the myrtle on the background window sill. The woman is cleverly integrated into a contemporary context by her elegant Venetian residential setting and the sleeping dog at the foot of her bed as a symbol of marital fidelity.[13] Even though the woman appears in a familiar Renaissance setting, her clearly aristocratic status and faultless beauty maintain the idealization which is central to the allure of the Venus

12 "Venus of Urbino," The Uffizi, accessed April 3, 2020, https://www.uffizi.it/en/artworks/venus-urbino-titian.

13 "Venus of Urbino."

pudica. Venus's flirtatious eye contact is complemented by the sensuality of her left hand's position and the soft, inviting appearance of her bedding. Her gaze balances the uninhibited exposure of her breasts and reinstitutes the pose's characteristic sexuality. The almost disguised identity of the goddess adds to the painting's intrigue and, despite minor formal differences, is successful in its evocation of a sexualized modesty.

The figure of Venus was depicted more than once in Titian's works, a fact which is unsurprising given his status among the Venetian school of Renaissance artists and the continued popularity of mythological subject matter. His later painting, *Venus with a Mirror* (1555) (Figure 7), conforms slightly more to the established characteristics of the Venus pudica pose, where her arms follow the traditional position, but her right hand holds a portion of fabric which aids her in covering her pubic area. She is therefore not completely nude, as her lower half is covered by the rich cloth and her arms and head are adorned with jewellery. As in Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus*, Titian includes additional figures who interact with Venus, in this case, two cupids who hold the mirror and move to crown her with a garland. Once again, the artist transformed the cool detachedness of the stone Medici Venus into the idealized Renaissance figure with long blonde hair and a flushed pale face, and removed her from the scene of her birth to include the popular iconography of the mirror associated with love and beauty.[14] This new setting in which the Venus pudica is placed accentuates her beauty and thus does not remove from the pose's sensuality. Even she appears to admire her own beauty, and so the modesty of her posture is likely not the result of self-consciousness in the presence of an onlooker. Her beauty becomes undeniable as jewellery

14 "Titian: Venus with a Mirror," National Gallery of Art, accessed April 2, 2020, https://www.nga.gov/collection/highlights/titian-venus-with-a-mirror.html.

and fabric richly decorate her body and her right arm fails to completely cover her breasts, providing a calculated level of exposure to ensure her attractiveness. As in Titian's previous work, her placement in a familiar residential setting makes her sexuality seem obtainable and all the more enticing, an example of a Renaissance adaptation of the traditional figure which retains, if not augments, the original sexuality.

These later adaptations of the Venus pudica were not limited to painting, and the Neoclassical *Venus Italica* (1822-1823) (Figure 8) by Antonio Canova recreated the subject in its initial medium. This figure is different from its predecessors in that she holds a piece of fabric to cover much of her lower body along with both her pubic area and one breast. While her left arm conforms to the motion covering her chest, her right does not perform the same traditional gesture toward her genitals and rests instead higher on her body just below her breasts. Aside from these admittedly important differences, this Venus more closely resembles her ancient counterparts than those from the Renaissance. This is true, of course, because of Canova's chosen medium, but also because of its intention as a replacement for the Medici Venus which was removed from the Uffizi by Napoleon Bonaparte.[15] The turn of the *Venus Italica*'s head, her hairstyle, and the position of her legs are indeed quite similar to those of the Medici Venus, a carefully calculated intention influenced by Canova's numerous detail studies of the ancient figure. Although the Neoclassical sculpture appears more closed off compared to some of the other figures due to her forward bend at the hips, arm positions, and drapery, there is nonetheless a sense of eroticized sensuality and vulnerability.[16] Canova's fascination with the nude female

15 Johns, "The Conceptualization of Form," 130.

16 Johns, "The Conceptualization of Form," 132.

figure is successfully translated into his sculpture. Venus's drapery clings to the underlying form of her legs and becomes a significant part of the composition, the graceful folds serving to "modernize the mythological theme" and support the marble figure without the addition of an adjacent object.[17] The artist also tinted much of the sculptural surface with a pale pink wash, not unlike the pigmentation of sculpture in antiquity, a technique which enhanced the soft tactility of her flesh and her conformity to contemporary ideals of beauty. Because the *Venus Italica* differs from her ancient equivalents in such ways, the innovative figure was admired for modernizing Venus's attractiveness and consequently renewing the ancient subject's sexuality for contemporary society.

Even beyond the Neoclassical movement, the Venus pudica continued to experience innovation which, while altering some of her formal characteristics, preserved her sexual appeal. Edouard Manet's *Olympia* (1863) (Figure 9) is a modern example of such innovation. Manet replaces Venus with the figure of a modern woman, but her name may serve as a reference to Mount Olympus, the divine home of the Greek gods including Aphrodite. Her jewellery and bedroom setting recall both of Titian's works, and her pose was evidently influenced by the *Venus of Urbino*. In this sense, Manet's *Olympia* exhibits less of a direct adoption of the Venus pudica concept than an indirect inheritance through this Renaissance predecessor. This arm pose aligns with Praxiteles's Aphrodite of Cnidus rather than following later developments but nonetheless provides equal sexual emphasis when compared to more genuine examples of the pudica gesture. This action serves to identify "the pubis as

17 Johns, "The Conceptualization of Form," 135.

the defining aspect of woman" and is thus expressly sexual.[18] It is also possible to interpret her left hand gesture, which appears to block rather than simply to cover, as heightened 'modesty' in compensation for her bare chest. Her direct eye contact with the viewer displays no evidence of true modesty, however, instead offering a sort of confrontational invitation indicative of the character's promiscuity. Manet used the pudica's inherent sexuality to his artwork's own benefit, characterizing Olympia as a prostitute through the symbolism of the orchid in her hair, the oriental fabric on which she lies, and black ribbon around her neck.[19] This fact alone is enough to confirm the sexual nature of the Venus pudica, for in choosing a pre-existing type upon which to model a prostitutional figure one would surely select one with such an established character.

Because the Venus pudica type has had its original meaning and formal qualities known and recreated for millennia, the various adaptations and alterations it has experienced were certainly unavoidable. The fame of its establishing figures, including the Aphrodite of Cnidus and the Capitoline and Medici Venuses, has ensured that the majority of its artistic recreations have maintained the goddess as their central figure. Each of these Venuses clearly acknowledge the role that the pudica pose has in expressing her sexuality, and even through formal alterations the artists have made efforts to maintain this characteristic effect. It is true that those figures created in antiquity had an increased importance to religious functions and so the Venus served

18 Nanette Salomon, "The Venus Pudica: Uncovering Art History's 'Hidden Agendas' and Pernicious Pedigrees," in *Generations and Geographies in the Visual Arts: Feminist Readings*, ed. Griselda Pollock (London: Routledge Press, 1996), 105.

19 Byron Nelson, "The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers, Review," *Journal of Social History* 21, no. 2 (Winter 1987): 393.

a different purpose to society. Even as this importance diminished over time, her role as a symbol of love and sexuality was not forgotten but rather was adapted from worship to artistic commentaries on contemporary ideals of beauty. The typification relates more strongly, therefore, to the gesture's expression than to its formal qualities.

Adoptions of the pose for figures other than Venus or Aphrodite are rare due to its intrinsic association with the mythological representation of love. The only two examples provided here were Masaccio's *Expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden* and Manet's *Olympia*, and they display disparate levels of success. Containing Christian and secular subject matter respectively, it is unsurprising that the extent to which the artworks maintained the Venus pudica's inherent sexuality differ on the basis of religion. While Manet's work adopts the pose along with its sexual connotations, Masaccio's radically transforms its meaning to display the shame of its biblical event. In this case, the modesty of the figure's gesture remains true, contrary to all others which use it to entice the viewer and draw attention to its female sexuality. The inherent sexuality of the pose, although unlike the modesty designated by its title, is a result of such 'modest' actions. This has ensured that, with only a few exceptions, the type has been limited to its original pagan subject matter or alternative sexual imagery. The sexual undertones of the proposed 'modesty' that have characterized the pose since its ancient establishment have become so deeply intertwined with its original and ancient divinity that it is not easily expandable beyond the ancient pagan goddess of love, thereby ensuring the type's interpretative continuity.

Bibliography

Clark, David Lang. "Poliziano's *Kupris Anadyomene* and Botticelli's *Birth of Venus*." *Word and Image* 22, no. 4 (June 2012): 390-397.

Clifton, James. "Gender and Shame in Masaccio's *Expulsion from the Garden of Eden*." *Art History* 22, no. 5 (December 1999): 637-655.

Havelock, Christine Mitchell. *The Aphrodite of Knidos and Her Successors: A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Janson, H. W. *History of Art*. New York City: Abrams Books, 1962.

Johns, Christopher M. S. "The Conceptualization of Form and the Modern Sculptural Masterpiece: Canova's Drawings for 'Venus Italica'." *Master Drawings* 41, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 128-139.

Musei Capitolini. "Statue of 'Capitoline Venus'." Accessed March 25, 2020, http://www.museicapitolini.org/en/collezioni/percorsi_per_sale/palazzo_nuovo/gabinetto_della_venere/statua_della_venere_capitolina.

National Gallery of Art. "Titian: Venus with a Mirror." Accessed April 2, 2020, https://www.nga.gov/collection/highlights/titian-venus-with-a-mirror.html.

Nelson, Byron. "The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers, Review." *Journal*

of Social History 21, no. 2 (Winter 1987): 392-394.

Salomon, Nanette. "The Venus Pudica: Uncovering Art History's 'Hidden Agendas' and Pernicious Pedigrees." In *Generations and Geographies in the Visual Arts: Feminist Readings*, edited by Griselda Pollock, 87-114. London: Routledge Press, 1996.

The Uffizi. "Birth of Venus." Accessed March 29, 2020, https://www.uffizi.it/en/artworks/birth-of-venus.

The Uffizi. "Venus of Urbino." Accessed April 3, 2020, https://www.uffizi.it/en/artworks/venus-urbino-titian.

Wohl, Hellmut. "Masaccio." *Grove Art Online* (2003): 1-26.

Figures

Figure 1. Roman copy after Praxiteles, Venere Colonna, 2nd century CE, white marble, 205 cm. Pio Clementino Museum, Rome.

Figure 2. Roman copy after Praxiteles, Capitoline Venus, unknown date, marble, 193 cm. Musei Capitolini, Rome.

Figure 3. Cleomenes, Medici Venus, 2nd century BCE, Parian marble, 153 cm. The Uffizi, Florence.

Figure 4. Sandro Botticelli, The Birth of Venus, 1485, tempera on canvas, 172.5 x 278.5 cm. The Uffizi, Florence.

Figure 5. Masaccio, Expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, 1424-1427, fresco, 214 x 90 cm. Capella Brancacci, Santa Maria del Carmine, Florence.

Figure 6. Titian, Venus of Urbino, 1538, oil on canvas, 119 x 165 cm. The Uffizi, Florence.

Figure 7. Titian, Venus with a Mirror, 1555, oil on canvas, 124.5 x 105.5 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington.

Figure 8. Antonio Canova, Venus Italica, 1822-1823, Carrara marble, 175.3 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Figure 9. Edouard Manet, Olympia, 1863, oil on canvas, 130.5 x 191.0 cm. Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

Artemis and Emotional Support in the Lives of Spartan Boys and Men

Danka Davidović

Abstract

Artemis is a goddess commonly associated with young girls and their upbringing, but the reality in Sparta was that she had a much wider sphere of influence, particularly in the lives of Spartan boys and men. As male citizens received their education in Sparta's agoge then graduated into their mandatory military service, Artemis remained a key figure in their lives. In this essay, I argue that Artemis was significant to them because she supported their emotional needs throughout their upbringing and military duties. She helped foster the emotional maturation of the boys and helped the men cope with battle by offering comfort and a space to regulate their emotions. The reality of Artemis serving as a support figure does not coincide with the popular view of Spartans as battle-ready warriors, created as a result of what François Ollier coined the "Spartan mirage." This essay concludes by evaluating the legitimacy of the "Spartan mirage" in this context.

Artemis is frequently known as the patron goddess of young girls, the one who protects maidens and guides them as they experience puberty and approach marriage and motherhood. In Sparta, though she maintained her connection to young girls, Artemis was relevant in the upbringing of all full-citizen children, and as such her role in the lives of boys cannot be overlooked. Furthermore, once a Spartan male reached adulthood, his worship of and reliance

on the goddess continued. This essay aims to demonstrate that Artemis was significant in the lives of Spartan boys and men in her support of their emotional needs. The goddess was key in the emotional maturation of boys, as well as the necessary emotional readiness men required for battle. This, in turn, challenges the so-called "Spartan mirage" introduced by François Ollier in his 1933 book *Le Mirage Spartiate*, part of which includes the belief that male citizens were trained to be the ideal soldier: one who was always battle-ready and never lacking in courage. In looking closely at the Spartan education system and the rituals boys underwent, as well as men in warfare and the role of Artemis' sanctuaries in their lives, her connection to emotion is evident.

The Spartan education system, known as the *agoge*, provided boys with both a scholarly education, teaching composition and rhetoric, for instance, and a physical education. The education system was closely linked with Artemis, specifically in her form as Artemis Orthia, as her sanctuary in Sparta was the setting of its exercises.[1] It cannot be denied that the process of the *agoge* included many activities aimed at military preparedness by making boys physically fit, skilled users of weapons, and disciplined soldiers. For example, Xenophon tells us that the Spartan state gave boys small portions of food in order to accustom them to functioning on an empty stomach, allowing them to "accommodate themselves more readily to anything put before them, and at the same time … enjoy better health."[2]

1 Nigel M. Kennell, *The Gymnasium of Virtue: Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 126, http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1819&site=ehost-live.

2 Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 2.5.

However, the *agoge* was the boys' daily experience throughout most of their growth, development, and maturation, including their journey through puberty, so it was necessary that their education also supported their emotional growth.

This would have been a highly emotional period in their young lives, just as it is for children and adolescents today, as they came to terms with and began to understand their feelings and, especially in the context of their future as soldiers, their fears. Not only that, but their feelings regarding hitting milestones and moving from age group to age group would have been significant as well, likely similar to a modern child graduating from middle school and becoming a high schooler. For this reason, at each interval, Spartan boys experienced a rite of passage, a ceremony designed to facilitate their integration into their new status and group, preparing them for the major change. The *agoge* was organized into three age groups: children, teenagers, and young men, referred to as *paides*, *paidiskoi*, and *hebontes,* respectively.[3] Of these age groups, the *paidiskoi* underwent a rite of passage associated with Artemis Orthia before becoming *hebontes*. The rite consisted of two teams of boys, one of which would be armed with whips and made to protect cheeses sitting on the altar in Artemis Orthia's sanctuary, and the other would be expected to attempt to steal the cheeses while avoiding a flogging.[4] Events such as this one reflected the value placed in competition, and, as Paul Cartledge puts it, "all Greeks … liked a good contest," and the Spartans were certainly of the most passionate in this; even joining a *syssition* or "communal dining mess" was a competitive

3 Kennell, *The Gymnasium of Virtue*, 117.

4 Donald G. Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*, 2nd ed. (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), 178, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1834779&ppg=1.

process on which a man's citizenship was partly dependent.[5] It was once a Spartan boy reached the age group of *hebontes*, the age group to which the cheese-stealing ceremony initiated them, that he was expected to enter into the competition to join a *syssition*. Having the experience of a high-stakes face-off against whips may have emotionally prepared the boys for the equally, though differently, high-stakes face-off they would soon be experiencing once they completed their rite of passage and passed into the next group. Similarly, the Artemis Orthia sanctuary itself can be viewed as a physical location symbolizing the graduation from "wild adolescence to tame civic maturity," both physically, as a person passes the goddess' sanctuary into Sparta, and metaphorically as children complete their education.[6] Since the activities of the *agoge* largely took place at the goddess' sanctuary, Paul Cartledge's word choice of "adolescence" to "maturity" highlights the analogy in children entering the *agoge* as undisciplined boys, ill-prepared for their adult lives, and leaving it ready to face their citizen responsibilities. Artemis Orthia was there to facilitate and support Spartan boys' gradual transition and first step into *Spartiate* life, a daunting step to take and one in need of emotional encouragement.

Furthermore, while the *agoge* aimed to ensure emotional preparedness for stressful situations, religious activity at the Artemis Orthia sanctuary also served the purpose of creating bonds. In the context of their education, Spartan boys underwent grueling military exercises of various kinds, which taught them to fight and improved their physical fitness, with many of these exercises taking

5 Paul Cartledge, "To die for?," *History Today* 52 (2002): 23.

6 Paul Cartledge, "City and Chora in Sparta: Archaic to Hellenistic," *British School at Athens Studies* 4 (1998): 43-44, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40960256.

place within the sanctuary of the goddess. However, the underlying context of ritual and cult was of real importance in those events, rather than the exercises themselves, because it was through religious means that the Spartan state could "inculcat[e] in [boys] the desire to fight for [their] city."[7] In an effort to create effective and efficient warriors, military training would undoubtedly be necessary, but creating a bond of patriotism and pride between the soon-to-be soldier and his state was invaluable. The bond supplied the reason and motivation for the soldier to tap into his courage, apply his training, and fight. Offerings that have been found at the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia serve as physical evidence of this bond. In comparing finds over the course of the Archaic and Classical periods of Spartan history, one can see that around the 6th century BCE, bronze votive figures are found in increased quantities at this sanctuary.[8] This is coincidentally understood to be the time of the founding of the *agoge* by Lykourgos, which may be relevant to the sanctuary's growth in popularity, particularly because many of the figurines connect to warfare.[9] More specifically, Georgina Muskett reports that one of the most common figurine designs is that of a warrior, but that other types, such as animal figurines, can also be interpreted as having a connection to war.[10] Hoplite figurines would have been dedicated at the sanctuary

7 Kennell, *The Gymnasium of Virtue*, 137.

8 Stephen Hodkinson, "Patterns of bronze dedications at Spartan sanctuaries, c.650-350 BC: towards a quantified database of material and religious investment," *British School at Athens Studies* 4 (1998): 58, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40960258.

9 Kennell, *The Gymnasium of Virtue*, 136.

10 Georgina Muskett, "Votive Offerings from the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, Sparta, in Liverpool Collections," *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 109 (2014): 164, 166, https://www.jstor.org/stable/44082091.

by those who "had endured or were about to endure the rites of passage that would transform them into warriors."[11] Not only that, but figurines of horses were found in abundance, which points to an element of the goddess' cult relating to young horsemen, who enjoyed her protection and instruction.[12] Another kind of emotional bond, which was no less important, was the kind formed between peers. Of those aforementioned exercises in Artemis Orthia's sanctuary, ones that involved teamwork would have facilitated the creation of close relationships between teammates, necessary to successfully completing challenges. Furthermore, simply experiencing the same demanding and difficult, though rewarding, education would have united the children and this bond was outwardly apparent in their appearance. Just as maidens were expected to present themselves in such a way as to emphasize their budding sexuality and unmarried status, Spartan males were expected to dress according to their social role as well.[13] Xenophon tells us that boys were given only one garment to wear year-round.[14] This outfit, along with their small food portions, which Nigel Kennell equates with fasting, resembles aspects of rites of passage and visibly sets the boys apart from the rest of Spartan society.[15]

As for Spartan men, though they had graduated from the *agoge* and had aged out of the protection Artemis offered

11 Kennell, *The Gymnasium of Virtue*, 136.

12 Kennell, 142.

13 P. Christesen, "Athletics and Social Order in Sparta in the Classical Period," *Classical Antiquity* 31, no. 2 (October 2012): 235, https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ca.2012.31.2.193.

14 Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 2.4.

15 Kennell, *The Gymnasium of Virtue*, 123.

to youths, they were still closely connected to the goddess. As grown men, their connections to her were also not limited to her form as Artemis Orthia, though that form did remain relevant even after their transition out of the education system. Masks found at the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, dating from the 7th to the 5th centuries BCE, are thought to be replicas of masks used in ritual performances.[16] The details of this ritual are not known, but the masks likely served to "express the dichotomy between an idealized and grotesque physical appearance."[17] From those present in the archaeological record, seven categories of mask have been distinguished: "old women, youths, warriors, portraits, satyrs, gorgons, and caricatures."[18] These categories all fit within the dichotomy described by P. Christesen, and they speak to the Spartan value of discipline and their ideas about the fitness standard to which all Spartan citizens were expected to hold themselves.[19] According to Xenophon, men were given just enough food to ensure they did not eat too little or overeat.[20] Moreover, while other Greeks were released of physical fitness expectations upon reaching adulthood, the Spartans were not and would be expected to hunt to stay strong and maintain their endurance.[21] According to Lykourgos, who set these expectations, a man would remain healthy and strong with the rations described above and a reasonable amount of physical activity, but without exercise that same amount of

16 Jonah Lloyd Rosenberg, "The Masks of Orthia: Form, Function and the Origins of Theatre," *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 110 (2015): 247, 252, https://www.jstor.org/stable/44082112.

17 Christesen, "Athletics and Social Order," 243.

18 Rosenberg, "The Masks of Orthia," 248.

19 Christesen, "Athletics and Social Order," 243.

20 Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 5.3.

21 Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 4.7.

food would leave a man weak and overweight.[22] Clearly, even though they were no longer under the goddess' protection, she was holding Spartan men accountable with regards to their lifestyle and fitness expectations through this ritual. Not only that, but Artemis was also keeping Spartans invested in hunting thanks to the custom that only those men who had just hunted would be allowed to participate in the feast at the festival for the goddess of the hunt.[23] These physical requirements were part of remaining ready for battle, both in terms of physical ability and confidence in that physical ability. As before any major daunting event in one's life, the emotional regulation afforded by confidence is unmatched in preparing oneself to face a stressful or unpleasant situation. In today's world, this could perhaps be compared to how preparation for a presentation leaves one less nervous and ready emotionally to face it.

While the above is a more indirect, though no less significant, way in which Artemis supported the emotional readiness of men for battle, she was also present in a more direct way as soldiers prepared to set out. It is in this instance that Artemis Orthia was not the only form of Artemis that was relevant to Spartans. In addition, her role as protectress of children may not have been relevant, but her position as protectress of borders and liminal spaces was. In particular, in this role she served as a scout watching for danger and also

22 Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 5.8.

23 Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*, 178-179.

as a skilled huntress, and by extension, warrior.[24] All around the Peloponnese, sanctuaries of Artemis were located in rural and urban contexts. Susan Guettel Cole counted the number of sanctuaries of the goddess mentioned by Pausanias, finding that there were forty-nine in the Peloponnese as a whole, twenty-nine of which were in the country and eighteen of which were located on a boundary either between two cities or two territories.[25] Though the whole of the Peloponnese is not relevant in a discussion of Lakonia, these statistics are representative of the kinds of sanctuaries to Artemis the Spartans presided over, since those would have been largely in the wilderness or at borders too. Cole argues that "the theme that unites the most distinctive sites of Artemis is the idea of dangerous or threatened passage."[26] It is in this way that her sanctuaries are important sites to Spartan soldiers, especially on campaign. Her temples were known to be strategic locations for defense in battles because of their placement.[27] For instance, Artemis supervised and protected entrances and exits of all kinds, such as mountain passes, which were critical to defend and have control over in

24 Susan Guettel Cole, *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 184, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/reader.action?docID=224760&ppg=7; Heather Maureen Loube, "Sanctuaries and Cults of Artemis in Post-Liberation Messene: Spartan Mimeses?" (PhD diss., University of Ottawa, 2013), 43, https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/dissertations-theses/sanctuaries-cults-artemis-post-liberation-messene/docview/1354523724/se-2?accountid=9894.

25 Cole, *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space*, 180.

26 Cole, *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space,* 184.

27 Cole, 187.

wartime.[28] Thus, Artemis was equated with protection and security in the Spartan man's mind, especially if he ever experienced a battle in which her sanctuary was a point of defense. Having a sacred, well-placed space as a defensive headquarters created strong associations of feelings of safety, which could provide a haven for a soldier struggling with the stresses of war. Heather Maureen Loube details a number of sanctuaries in which Artemis was specifically associated with warfare. At Pyrrhichos, her iconography of a shield and spear alongside a bow or whip shows her as a goddess of hunting while also being a warrior.[29] Loube also mentions the sanctuary of Artemis Hegemone, whose epithet is "one who leads" and can be interpreted as having a military connotation.[30] Moreover, the goddess herself was associated with protection alongside her physical sanctuaries. She was believed to turn back enemy attacks, and was, for instance, credited with turning back an attack by the Amazons near Pyrrhichos.[31] In addition, Artemis Hegemone was believed to drive the enemy away by causing them confusion and panic.[32] No doubt this only further cemented the goddess as a haven to which a soldier could turn to gain a sense of security and relief.

Artemis and her sanctuaries were also key in supporting men as they prepared to campaign and fought in war. It took effort and careful mental preparation to gather one's courage enough to set off on campaign, let alone march into battle, with the knowledge that they or their close friends may not make it back. With Artemis' support, soldiers were

28 Cole, 185.

29 Loube, "Sanctuaries and Cults of Artemis," 43.

30 Loube, 53-54.

31 Cole, *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space,* 187.

32 Loube, "Sanctuaries and Cults of Artemis," 54.

able to make the necessary transformations for setting off and processing the intense emotions that came with it; her sanctuaries were the locations for this crucial step of warfare and her rituals facilitated the process. It was recognized that once this step and the physical sanctuary were passed, there would be no turning back.[33] The need for emotional support did not end once the army set off on their campaign, though, and before engaging in battle but when the enemy was nearby, the Spartans always sacrificed a goat to Artemis Agrotera.[34] During the battle itself, Artemis Agrotera was believed to have "inspired soldiers at critical moments," by appearing in a dramatic manner as a flash of light to signify a turning point in a battle.[35] There is no doubt that an event interpreted as the appearance of the goddess herself would have strengthened the resolve of the army and encouraged them to continue fighting in the face of the great difficulties they were up against. At points on a military campaign where the emotional needs of the soldiers were increased, such as climaxes of battles, having an entity such as Artemis to which they could turn for comfort and encouragement likely made a difference.

Non-Spartans, both ancient and modern, viewing Sparta from the outside frequently misinterpret and misunderstand Spartan society and culture in such a way that has created the effect of the "Spartan mirage," a term coined by François Ollier in 1933 in his book *Le Mirage Spartiate*. The "Spartan mirage" refers to an idealized and distorted image of Sparta as a *polis* of perfect, battle-ready citizens, among

33 Cole, *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space,* 188.

34 Loube, "Sanctuaries and Cults of Artemis," 49; Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 22.2.

35 Cole, *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space,* 189.

other unrealistic suppositions.[36] While it is true that Spartan boys began physical and military training at a young age and were prepared for battle with the goal of promoting efficiency and effectiveness, it is misleading to not look farther than this into the Spartan military structure as otherwise the picture becomes one of militaristic obsession.[37] As demonstrated by this essay, there was much more to the Spartan military training and success than physical preparation. The Spartans cannot be thought of as untouchable soldiers due to the simple fact that the process of becoming a soldier and the experience of being one affected them in such a way that they sought emotional support in Artemis. Growing boys entering a grueling and daunting education system needed to understand and process their emotions related to the changes they were experiencing and the knowledge that they were on the path to their future as soldiers. Grown Spartan men did not need any less emotional support as they faced setting out on campaigns and entering into battle. At no point could a Spartan have been an unfeeling fighting machine of any sort, and the role of Artemis in meeting their emotional needs cannot be overlooked as a major reason Spartans managed to perform so well in battle.

Artemis may have been a goddess well known for her connection to girls in the ancient Greek world, but she also had a close relationship with all Spartan males for the majority of their lives. As boys going through the education system and attempting to understand their changing lives, turning to Artemis Orthia and her sanctuary was crucial. The goddess' initiation rituals and her sanctuary as a setting

36 Jonathan M. Hall, *A History of the Archaic Greek World, ca. 1200-479 BCE,* 2nd ed. (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2014), 227, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1295018&ppg=1.

37 Hall, *A History of the Archaic Greek World,* 231.

used to form emotional bonds provided the boys with crucial support, which aided in their emotional development and ability to cope with the state's expectations of them. As men needing to emotionally prepare for warfare and to cope with the horrors that came with it, Artemis and her sanctuaries were havens to which they could turn. Under these stressful circumstances, it would not have been possible for Spartan males to function without their emotional needs being met. For this reason, the perception in the "Spartan mirage" of the Spartans as untouchable warriors is incorrect.

Bibliography

Cartledge, Paul. "City and chora in Sparta: Archaic to Hellenistic." *British School at Athens Studies* 4 (1998): 39-47. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40960256.

Cartledge, Paul. "To die for?" *History Today* 52 (2002): 20-25.

Christesen, P. "Athletics and Social Order in Sparta in the Classical Period." *Classical Antiquity* 31, no. 2 (October 2012): 193-255. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ca.2012.31.2.193.

Cole, Susan Guettel. *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/reader.action?docID=224760&ppg=7.

Hall, Jonathan M. *A History of the Archaic Greek World, ca. 1200-479 BCE.* 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2014. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1295018&ppg=1.

Hodkinson, Stephen. "Patterns of bronze dedications at Spartan sanctuaries, c.650-350 BC: towards a quantified database of material and religious investment." *British School at Athens Studies* 4 (1998): 55-63. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40960258.

Kennell, Nigel M. *The Gymnasium of Virtue: Education and*

Culture in Ancient Sparta. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995. http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1819&site=ehost-live.

Kyle, Donald G. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1834779&ppg=1.

Loube, Heather Maureen. "Sanctuaries and Cults of Artemis in Post-Liberation Messene: Spartan Mimeses?" PhD diss., University of Ottawa, 2013. https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/dissertations-theses/sanctuaries-cults-artemis-post-liberation-messene/docview/1354523724/se-2?accountid=9894.

Muskett, Georgina. "Votive Offerings from the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, Sparta, in Liverpool Collections." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 109 (2014): 159-173. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44082091.

Rosenberg, Jonah Lloyd. "The Masks of Orthia: Form, Function and the Origins of Theatre." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 110 (2015): 247-261. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44082112.

Comparisons of the Greek and Roman Deification: Greeks, Romans and the Immortality of the Soul

Kathleen Dean

Abstract

The Greek and Roman religions have often been compared to one another for a variety of reasons. One area which holds as many similarities as it does differences is the deification of certain people throughout the Greek and Roman history. Showing the strength of the person being deified was one of the main goals to apotheosis. While the Greeks tended to deify mythological characters like Psyche, Dionysus or Herakles. The Romans were more inclined to deify emperors such as Julius Caesar or Augustus. This paper looks specifically at the commonalities and differences found between the two and looks closely at the reasoning behind immortalizing the soul. The Romans had many reasonings to why certain Emperors could attain apotheosis while the Greeks in a sense were more lenient. Greek figures were almost always directly linked to a god in order to become divine. Roman figures on the other hand were people of power and their relatives. By looking at these differences it helps to better understand the two cultures.

Roman and Greek cultures are confoundingly similar in many ways, as they both have gods that have natures that resemble one another, and heroes with analogous stories. There are of course differences between the Greek and Roman deification process. When it comes to the Greeks, they have a tendency to deify heroes, such as Hercules or

Dionysus. Alternatively, the Romans tended to deify humans, typically emperors, and occasionally their wives and children should they die young. Therefore, Roman apotheosis was a potentiality for humans that were members of the Imperial family. With these deifications comes power. The socio-political presence of the *nobiles* could be spread empirically throughout the empire via portraits on currency. Additionally, busts and reliefs were carved and sold throughout the empire in the Imperial family's name. Practices such as these helped emphasize the *auctoritas* of the family in tying their lineage with a close proximity to the divine. Apotheosis of an immediate relative is more successful than saying that the emperor and his kin were distantly related to Venus or Mars. At the root of religion is a need and a fear: the soul has a need for reason, appetite and will, but harbours the fear of death and the unknown. It wants to know the mysteries of the universe, but knows the great cost that comes with knowledge. Unable to experience the real sequence of posthumous transcendence, the introduction of apotheosis seems to be the natural succession past these fears. Despite their sibling-like animosity, Romans and Greeks shared many aspects of their culture and practices; inseparable, it is impossible not to jointly discuss each nation with respect to each other when dealing with either.

Apotheosis, or the process of deification of a human, was a term coined around the time of Alexander the Great.[1] While "apotheosis" is a Greek word, the Romans, too, practiced it. To many Greek philosophers, mortals were already divine in a sense, and that through death they returned to a natural divine state, as it was theorized that inhabiting their mortal body is what erased their divinity

1 Max Radin. "Apotheosis." *The Classical Review*, 30, no. 2 (1916): 44. www.jstor.org/stable/698798.

upon conception.[2] The infamously unanswerable question: the potential of life after death; the Hellenic Greeks were one of the first peoples to philosophize on the continuance of the soul posthumously. Richard Lewis Farnell, author of *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, posits that the organization of beliefs on the afterlife came from the Hellenic tradition of "the soul's survival of the body."[3] Infamous for their elaborate interpretations of the world around them, Hellenic philosophers harboured a secret sentimentalism for the dead and the dying, and therefore believed that a heaven would await those who were patient enough. With Socrates' quote that "true philosophers… are ever seeking to release the soul" serving as a solemn reminder of the universe's harsh reality, and the desire to die to uncover the fear of the unknown which haunts all who face it yet return home.[4]

The Romans swiftly took up where the Greeks left off, branching according to purpose. The Romans decidedly went against the abstract approach of Hellenic Greeks, choosing a pragmatic take to institutional religion: their kings were their gods, and the Imperial cult of Rome deified all those elected by its Senate, dead or alive. Moreover, with a morality weighted towards the pride of triumphal glory, Rome also treated their generals like gods—perhaps that is more of an indication of the political disregard towards practices of religious piety over personal advancement within civic circles. The practice of apotheosis for the neighbouring cultures serves as demonstrating the set of values each nation regarded as foundational for the ascendance into a divine afterlife.

---

2 *Ibid*, 44.

3 Lewis Richard Farnell. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, (The Clarendon Press, 1921), 3.

4 Plato, *Phaedo*, 67d.

The scientific, metaphilosophical rhetoric of Aristotle and Plato decrees life everlasting having more to do with death as the release of the soul from "this earthly prison, and go to their pure home which is above"[5]—the untraversed plane of immaterial existence. This perspective was well-received among peers, if not considered the meagerest bit romantic, yet palatable, to believe. To transcend and be pure again, as it was during the soul's creation, was regarded as demonstrated in Plato's *Phaedo*. In light of the starch of heady philosophical theory on the afterlife, the work invites a softer, sympathetic view of Socrates who on the hour of his death becomes unshakable in his faith, who "appeared blessed… that in going to the other world he could not be without a divine call."[6] The comparison Plato makes with Socrates and the gods alludes to a shared afterlife, and the conversation between the two recounts individual immortality in defined terms. Socrates represents an auspicious Hellenic hero, worthy of exultation and apotheosis. Plato embodies the skeptic, yet intrigued observer in the average man, faced with a reality that has yet to affect him personally, but affected nevertheless by the exhibitionist tendency to bleed heavily over witnessing a passing. The fact that great scholars of Hellenic Greece also believe in a heaven is paramount to understanding why apotheosis is a natural cultural practice. The untouchable Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, fortified in their science, still cannot block out the rational fear of dying, and indulge the irrational drive to provide comforting alternatives against the ugliness of death. This instinct is human, as well as wariness of death being cultural as well. Spirits of the dead remained, according to lore, in existence upon earth alongside the mortals but who could also

5 *Ibid*, 114b.

6 *Ibid*, 58e.

transcend and exist alongside gods. Some people believed that prayer and strict observance allowed your soul to join that of the worshipped deity upon the death of the body.[7]

For the average Greek, common practice was to keep dead relatives and friends close immediately upon their passing due to a lasting affectionate regard towards the stray soul. There were rituals between family members and the deceased so that the ghost would not remain on earth forever, but would travel peacefully to the immortal plane of heaven.[8] The argument for dead worship explains the clause that if the souls continue to exist immortally, there is no reason to abandon them. The worship of the dead, often divided into subcategories classified by different rites according to whoever had died, naturally succeeds the small private practices of kinship rites. Those who belonged to ancestor-cults, hero-cults, and what Farnell calls "the general religious 'tendance'... of the dead," each had festivals and holidays in Hellenic culture, with additional chthonic priesthoods organizing separate rituals according to the status of the recently deceased to the divine.[9] Heroes—the ultimate divine-human relation—received grandiose dedications, as they were known to be demigods. To care for and please these spirits was the focus of the rites, and the decorated graves exist as status symbols of a well-loved individual while simultaneously providing insight on Hellenic belief in continuance and immortal presence of the soul. The reverence for the dead highlights the trepidation towards the unknown world of the dead and the mystical world of the gods. Many heroons were constructed on top of the graves of heroes, with cult ceremonies taking place in the heroons

7 Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, 5.

8 *Ibid*, 4.

9 *Ibid*, 2.

or directly outside. The ground for most heroon temples was sacred, and religious pollution of gravesites was a big concern for the Hellenes. All the superstition surrounding the chthonic deities indicates a respect for the dead driven by fear of potential ghostly wrath. Apotheosis and divine-like sanctions to great individuals acts as a trial for godhood—by studying oracles from mortals who became gods, scholars could learn more about heaven without dying. Proof resides in Socrates' "arguments from affinity" in *Phaedo*, wherein he tells Phaedo the soul is immaterial, invisible, and immortal, just like the gods.[10] The connection of gods and mortals being made of the same matter is a significant revelation as it demonstrates the true potential of humankind. The treatment of Ancient Greek and Roman champions posthumously is evidence that subconsciously, as is in accordance with human nature, there exists a desire for everlasting life for the common man that is inherent but subdued in the individual until death. Peak manhood is godhood, and therefore it is not a reach to say the Hellenes believed a person could achieve a sort of individual divinity upon death if they were worthy enough. Socrates, in Phaedo, is implied to have been guided to the afterlife by some divine force, as he was a venerable scholar and man. This type of death mirrors those of other Greek heroes, like Herakles and Odysseus, who were guided to an afterlife by Zeus. The only confound is that Plato has Socrates die in *Phaedo*, whereas the official Greek heroes seem to always vanish in a puff of smoke, showing their immortality by literally evading death.

Aside from the inherent divinity of heroes, the Greeks had mortals that became gods, but true to form, these people were often mythical already, like Herakles, Psyche, or Dionysus. Creating an illusion of attainability in apotheosis

10 Plato, *Phaedo*, 80b.

and an inclusive immortality resulted in complicating the human conceptualization of the supernatural. Virtues of the soul, according to the Hellenes, involved favouring humility, moderation, and intelligence over other moral values; those who exemplified these qualities could become gods. Nevertheless, the Greeks that become deified always have a connection to the gods in some way or another, whether they were a demi-god first like in the case of Herakles and Dionysus, or they were a lover of a god like the legend of Psyche. For example, Phaethon of Syria, who Hesiod describes as "a man like the gods" in the *Theogony*, was one of the first instances of Hellenic apotheosis of an "average mortal".[11] Upon his death, Phaethon becomes a "divine spirit" through his services as a priest of Aphrodite.[12] The young man demonstrates his humility, moderation and intelligence through observation of religious piety and servitude and so his apotheosis is natural and deserved. What escapes Hesiod, unbeknownst to him, is the irony of having "mortal" heroes germinating from divine family trees. Phaethon of Syria, being the son of Cephalus—a hero-figure and son of Hermes—was already a demigod and more-than-mortal before the story of his transcendence in the *Theogony*. Herakles, too, was already immortal—being the son of Zeus in legend as well as going through his trials as a ghost, living past the brink of death to the absurdity of biology. Hesiod's theory on the Four Ages of Man introduces a story concluding that "mortals who have passed away might now be divine powers", since humanity descended from the argonauts of the Golden Age, a millennium where gods and goddesses roamed the earth like mortals.[13] Divinity

11 Hesiod, *Theogony*, 985.

12 *Ibid*, 990.

13 Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, 12.

is almost always inherited and continues to be a theme throughout many hero creation stories in antiquity. Having your champions be godlike serves to project an image of invulnerability in all aspects of civic and personal life. Additionally, it promotes a dangerous self-actualization of individual immortality, through positioning the Hellenic nation and its people as descendants from gods, therefore having traces of divinity exemplified by the power of their civilizations. Bold as that statement may be, it is not so foolish to assume that the average Hellene may have felt superior to the average plebeian because they imbedded divinity in their institutions like brick and mortar. Nevertheless, Hesiod's works on heroes and their mortal sympathies establish another tenet of Hellenic apotheosis--the genial relation to the gods. Confounding this theory is the story of Psyche. Psyche was made immortal after falling in love and having a relationship with Cupid, the god of love. Zeus wanted both Cupid and Psyche to be equal so that Aphrodite might approve of the relationship, since throughout the myth, before her apotheosis, she ends up with Aphrodite.[14] Therefore he made Psyche a goddess, proclaiming, "Well, then, I make her immortal, so that all shall be equal."[15] The only ones able to instantly make a mortal a god in Greek mythology was the gods themselves. While everyone had a divine part to them, the ones that became official pantheon gods, like that of Zeus or Artemis, were manifested by other gods. Remember that Socrates was human, however... His

14 Thomas Shadwell, *Psyche a Tragedy / Written by Tho. Shadwell* (London, Printed by T.N. for Henry Herringman, 1675). Scene 6. https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/books/psyche-tragedy-written-tho-shadwell/docview/2240971840/se-2?accountid=9894.

15 *Ibid*.

godly ushering to heaven was a testament that mortals could be so favored by the divine that the treatment is one and the same upon death as it is for actual demigods. This was the drive for apotheosis and hero-cult practice throughout Hellenic antiquity; the paradoxical attainability of godhood. What remains a complication is the fact that Greek heroes needed to be dead in order to be gods, but were already on a route to immortality ordained by kinship *before* their death. If dying is the equalizer between a demigod and a mortal, the possibility of individual immortality is a valid conclusion to draw.

Plutarch serves archaeologists and scholars by being a "unique bridge between Greece and Rome" due to his disorganized knowledge of many of the varying customs in Greece, and through his personal connections to Roman politics.[16] Notedly, Plutarch also mentions the importance of the soul and the afterlife as important to the Romans as well. Romans, in their own right, believed that gods could be reborn as human and reside on earth, such as Alexander the Great being the embodiment of Zeus Ammon. While there is little known about the early religious traditions of the Romans, through their infective contact with Greece, there is evidence that shows they might have adopted most of the cult practices which originally belonged to the Hellenes, modified to fit Roman values. This is what is defined as the *interpretatio graeca*. Plutarch indicated that the "good education" of Hellenic tradition was absent from the beginning of Rome, and introduced only later via encounters with the Greeks, echoing the *interpretatio* -except for defining what "good education" consisted of. To

16 S. C. R. Swain "Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 110 (1990): 126. www.jstor.org/stable/631736.

Plutarch, this education was really a moral stance taught by interest in philosophy, yet was the key to overcoming the irrational passions of the soul. On many counts, the poet was wary of the Roman obsession with power, as well as the consequences it had on moral and physical corruption. Romans valued ambition, courage, bravery, and especially victory. Plutarch argued that "the [Roman] people arrogate power to themselves as the power of the [Roman] state grows."[17] He also figured "the significance of culture and education in his resistance to passions" was what made him, and ultimately the Hellenic Greeks as a whole, better than the Romans.[18] It would be incorrect to believe that the Romans did not believe in a sense of moral codes, as the social code known as the *mos maiorum* is proof of the opposite. *Mos maiorum* was "ancestral custom… time-honoured principles, traditional models, and rules of appropriate conduct, of time-tested policies, regulations, and well-established practices" which "not not only prescribed social behaviour in 'private' life, but also regulated all criminal and 'public' law, the state religion, as well as the military system."[19] Values of the *mos maiorum* included, in brief: a deep respect for the gods, to be loyal and credible, to have self-control, discipline and perseverance, as well as to know right from wrong through the Roman code of *virtus*—often thought of with respect to Machiavelli. While Plutarch is swift to defend the Greeks from their identity being stolen by the Romans, with good reason, one should not be trapped into thinking that the Romans were completely and utterly different from the

17 *Ibid*, 128.

18 Swain, "Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch," 135.

19 Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: an Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research* (Princeton University Press, 2010), 29.

Hellenes. They were just opportunistic.

The introduction of a divine lineage for the emperors of Rome was successful in creating a separate class of god-like mortals called the *nobiles* who were accorded celebrations and praise to the degree of Roman gods, but Rome's kings have truly always been its gods. In the beginning of Roman legend, the deity Quirinus was said to be disguised as Romulus, according to Plutarch, and served only on earth to establish the "founding [of] a city destined to be the greatest on earth for empire and glory", but who ultimately returned to "heaven" to continue his life as an immortal divinity.[20] There is no mention of Romulus dying, only that there exists a possibility of continuance to an afterlife. Quirinus admitting to living in heaven demonstrates proof of apotheosis on beings with supreme auctoritas - the final tenement of mos maiorum. Heaven is also where the soul of the god-emperors arrive upon death, such as that of Julius Caesar. Roman dynastic emperors were given the title *divus* when they were added to the Roman pantheon upon apotheosis.[21] This was the case when Julius Caesar was deified by Augustus: he became the first new god to the Roman Pantheon.[22] Caesar was thus depicted in art alongside other official gods; he was shown commonly alongside Venus and Mars Ultor. By observing the posture and the outfit depicted on Caesar in fig. 1, the style of garb and his presence beside Venus, Cupid and Mars cements Caesar as divine. Typically, mortals that became divine would be interpreted with stars and crowns,

20 Plutarch, *Romulus*, 28.

21 Radin, "Apotheosis," 44.

22 Encyclopaedia, Britannnica, Inc.. Encyclopedia of World Religions, Encyclopaedia Britannica Incorporated (2006): 88. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/detail.action?docID=361916.

but none of these remain from antiquity.[23] Caesar was not the only Roman emperor to be deified after his death. Others include Augustus, Claudius and Trajan. Emperors of Rome were otherwise known as *auctoritas principis*, meaning the "first citizen" of Rome, as well as he who held supreme moral authority over the Republic. Recall that the original first citizens of Rome, according to legend, were the gods Romulus and Remus. Therefore, to be titled with reference to the divine, promoting Emperors to *divus* makes sense. Additionally, within this explanation lies the secret to the Imperial Cult and the Roman practices of apotheosis. Hero-cults in Rome served as social and political moves rather than indicating a level of soulful purity like the Greeks believed. Some children and wives of emperors were also deified between the time of Julius Caesar and Constantine, and there exists accounts of two children of emperors who had undergone *damnatio memoriae* due to the popularity of Roman apotheosis. They were the daughter of Nero, Claudia, and the son of Domitian, Caesar. Claudia was the first child to be deified, but only lived for four months before her subsequent death. Since her father and mother were members of the Imperial dynasty, she was deified and given a temple, along with a priesthood.[24] In comparison to Claudia, Domitian's son Caesar was deified with little accompanying historical evidence or explanation.[25] Domitian's son may not have died in infancy, but rather early in childhood, around

23 Edmund Thomas. "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," *Journal of Roman Studies*, 107 (2017): 154-155. doi:10.1017/S0075435817000314.

24 Gwynaeth McIntyre. "Deification as Consolation: the Divine Children of the Roman Imperial Family," *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, 62, no. 2 (2013) 225. www.jstor.org/stable/24433673.

25 *Ibid*, 229.

seven or eight. Nevertheless, he is displayed on the currency as a baby.[26] The deification of Domitian's son, Caesar, combined with the fact that he was represented on coins, his image mass distributed and remembered by the populus, might have been so to facilitate the collective mourning that Domitian and his wife had experienced over the death of their child. Via apotheosis, Caesar would not be forgotten, and the parents would not be alone in their mourning; the empire could join them.[27] Deified mortals might also get their image preserved on a sacred piece of media, like furniture, or they might also have a banquet held in their honour; this was called *pulvinar*, and Claudia was awarded these rites as well.[28] Deified emperors had the potential to expand their reach beyond the Roman empire, exemplified by Julius Caesar's coinage showing up in archaeological sites across Europe.[29] Claudia was privileged enough to gain this honour, however her representation was not through a portrait, but rather a mention of her and her mother on the coin's inscription, emphasizing the divine lineage of Nero's family.[30] This is important to history as Nero never referred to himself as divine, perhaps because claiming to be divine could be an example of religious impiety against the values of *mos maiorum*, or a more personal offence against the gods themselves. It is also possible he felt that he did not need to characterize himself as god-descendant, instead choosing

26 *Ibid*.

27 *Ibid*, 231.

28 *Ibid*, 226.

29 Larry Kreitzer. "Apotheosis of the Roman Emperor." *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 53, no. 4 (1990): 212. www.jstor.org/stable/3210166.

30 McIntyre, "Deification as Consolation: the Divine Children of the Roman Imperial Family," 228.

to surround himself with relatives who were, securing his divine lineage nonetheless by claiming that the gods are all his kin.[31] Other examples of a godly family tree are the Flavian and Severan Imperial dynasty. The *nobiles* that claimed to be descendants from the first settlers of Rome were also believed to be descended from Venus, and in some cases, Mars. This is why both gods are prominent in Roman art and have temples devoted to them often. Julius Caesar devoted the Temple of Venus Genetrix to Venus as she was an ancestor of the Julian family.[32] On the Temple of Venus Genetrix, the pediment had a carving of Venus, and Mars—her lover—on her left. To the right of Venus was Aeneas. Aeneas' son, Iulius, was according to myth the founder of the Julian family line.[33] This is the reasoning behind the temple dedicated to the divine Julius, also known as 'Divus Iulius'. This temple was completed by Augustus, and was used to host legislative meetings. It was the only site to have done so during Augustus' rule.[34] By creating the Temple of Divus Iulius, Augustus made his ties to the imperial family stronger by honouring Julius Caesar who had come before him.[35] The Temple to Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus served a similar purpose of establishing that Augustus and his family were part of the dynasty which had come before

31 McIntyre, "Deification as Consolation: the Divine Children of the Roman Imperial Family," 228.

32 Olindo Grossi. "The Forum of Julius Caesar and the Temple of Venus Genetrix." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 13, (1936): 217. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4238590.

33 *Ibid*, 218.

34 Darryl A. Phillips. "The Temple of Divus Iulius and the Restoration of Legislative Assemblies under Augustus," *Phoenix*, 65, no. 3/4 (2011): 372. www.jstor.org/stable/41497569.

35 *Ibid*, 373.

him.[36] By deifying Caesar, Augustus not only created a new link to the gods for himself and his future descendants, but also distanced himself from Caesar.[37] As Divus Iulius, Caesar was unable to appear in the later funeral processions of the Augustus family, one of the main consequences of political deification.[38] Another reason for deifying Caesar was that the culmination of the problems that he had left behind posthumously actually created the perfect platform on which Augustus pronounced his divine state.[39] If Caesar - who had left Rome in disarray - could become a god, surely Augustus - who brought about a brighter future for Rome - should be made a god as well. As Shirley Case puts it in her review, an "emperor who restored a shattered society to a new condition of safety" has done what many regular citizens have failed to do—shoo away death from the doorstep, restored civility and reason, nurtured the soul, and acted as greatly as a god, and so he *must* be superhuman.[40] It wouldn't make sense otherwise.

Furthermore, it is not solely the males who go through apotheosis and the traditions associated with it. One such example is the wife of Augustus, Livia. In fig. 6, the iconography is very similar to that which is associated

36 *Ibid*, 372.

37 Edwin S. Ramage. "Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, 34, no. 2 (1985): 238. www.jstor.org/stable/4435922.

38 Edwin S. Ramage. "Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar," 239

39 Brian Bosworth. "Augustus, the Res Gestae and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." *The Journal of Roman Studie*s, 89 (1999): 7. www.jstor.org/stable/300731.

40 Shirley Jackson Case. "The Origin and Meaning of Greek Hero Cults." *The Journal of Religion*, 2, no. 4 (1922): 443. www.jstor.org/stable/1195310.

with Ceres, or as the Greeks know her, Demeter (see fig. 7). Both women's togas are styled in the same manner, with the draping done in a similar style, and both depictions have a piece of cloth draped over their heads, holding a cornucopia. Deified humans were often represented in the same pose, or even clothing, as certain gods in order to imply a connection. Like the cornucopia, portrayal of humans with emblems understood by the Romans at the time as belonging to one specific god over the other was typically done in a similar style to what the Greeks had done previously, but they altered the methodology and style to represent certain worldly aspects that Romans believed to be essential, like leaving wrinkles on the face to show wisdom from age. One look at Divus Augustus in fig. 4, and Mars Ultor in fig. 5, illuminates both Augustus and Mars as nearly identical, both even holding what appears to be a scroll. The simplest ways to tell who the muse was trying to impersonate were hidden in the distinctive facial features, or hairstyles. Livia was thought to be a kind of reincarnation or god in a mortal body of Ceres, which is speculated to be why statues of her appear remarkably like artistic representations of the goddess.[41] The fact that Livia is holding the cornucopia, a symbol of Ceres, might be a nod to her godhood, or that she was Ceres in mortal form like the story of Quirinius. It could be argued that the statue of Livia in fig. 6 *is* Ceres, however, the facial differences between the two statues, juxtaposed with the similarity of figure 6 to the portrait bust of Livia (see fig. 8) would prove otherwise. Livia was not only identified with Ceres, but retrospectively, other goddesses had features of Livia. Pietas (see fig. 9), Justitia (see fig. 10) and Salus (see fig. 11) each were represented in her likeness, and easily

41 Radin, "Apotheosis," 45.

recognizable to the public.[42] Just like Julius and Augustus before her, by having commercial items commissioned in her image, the empire would come to identify Livia as divine. Busts such as the one of Livia (see fig. 8) could be recreated much easier and sent around the empire versus creating a huge full statue every time. Coincidentally, the numerous ways in which Livia was represented as a godlike figure served to bolster the reputation and divinity of the rest of the emperors through their relationships with her. With this in mind, the outfit of the statue of Augustus is in the same style as that of Julius Caesar (see fig. 1) for the same reasons. Continuing with deified mortals, there were often statues made to resemble them, as well as nods to their mythos. For the Greek Psyche, she is shown not only as a mortal woman, but in some cases as a godlike figure with wings that are reminiscent of Cupid's very own. Psyche can be seen (see fig. 2) being revived after her death by Cupid; in this image she is still a mortal being whose lover is saving her. However, we see a later statue of Psyche (see fig. 3) with wings; while they are not the same as those of Cupid (see fig. 2), wings are indicative of a divine nature. The Greeks were not the only culture to create statues of gods to honour them, this practice was also done by the Romans throughout their empire. Finally, the Greeks and the Romans tended to separate immortals and mortals when it came to seeing them in reliefs or other art together. Typically, if a mortal is seen with an immortal figure, it is because the god is helping them or it is a familial relationship, although we do not see that often. We see this idea with the Greeks with Psyche, who had to become immortal to stay with Cupid, and with

42 Mary E. Hoskins Walbank. "Pausanias, Octavia and Temple E at Corinth." *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 84 (1989): 369. www.jstor.org/stable/30104565.

the Romans with Caesar, who was unable to be seen in later reliefs with the Julian family since he was deified.[43]

The Roman senate and emperor, organized in a group titled the Imperial Cult of Rome, were the ones that chose who was deified; in the case of Julius Caesar, he was deified by his adoptive son Augustus by election, an apotheosis which differs drastically from the godly deification of Psyche. Just like Greek heroes, emperors embodied the ultimate type of man within the republic. While the Greeks would scoff at the notion of promoting a man into a god before his death, as was the case for many *nobiles* during the Roman Republic, the similarities to Hellenic cult tradition are inescapable. Throughout the era of the Republic, there are multiple accounts of people who were *not* emperors, or maybe distantly related to the emperor's family at the least, going through their very own apotheosis. This was the case with Octavia and Mark Antony, who were only related to the current ruler, Julius Caesar, through his adoptive son Augustus - then known as Octavian. Octavia and her husband Mark Antony were deified when they visited Athens in 39/8 BC.[44] Upon arrival, the tale explains Mark Antony claimed to be Dionysus.[45] Interestingly in doing so, he was claiming to have been born as a god. Mark Antony not only claimed to be a god - something that would come with lots of honours - but he showed the image of his wife Octavia on the Dionysiac coins he had created, also establishing her

43 Ramage, "Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar," 239.

44 Antony E. Raubitschek. "Octavia's Deification at Athens." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 77 (1946): 146. www.jstor.org/stable/283451.

45 *Ibid*.

as born a god conjointly.[46] Mark Antony was, confusingly, married to Athena in Athens while visiting with Octavia.[47] In one version from the Elder Seneca, Mark Antony was asked to marry Athena and that "Antony said he would, but demanded a thousand talents from them by way of dowry."[48] Convinced of his divinity, Mark Antony demanded a dowry for a pantheon goddess in her patron city. The only reason he was married to Athena was the misunderstanding that he was a fellow Olympian, Dionysus.[49] Otherwise, mortal men were not worthy of goddesses. In some accounts, Octavia was characterized as Athena Polias, meaning she was a portion, or epithet, of Athena while in Athens.[50] When it comes to accounts of Mark Antony marrying Athena, this is an event that makes more sense in historical context, as his wife is often viewed as the epithet of Athena and celebrated as the goddess when they visited Athens.[51] Octavia, while an important member in Athens and being seen as their patron goddess, is typically not a goddess with a cult such as other epithets of Athena in other cities throughout the Greek and Roman lands. Additionally, she likely would not have had a temple made for her in any other city-state, especially not such an influential one like Corinth.[52] While she was still

46 Antony E. Raubitschek. "Octavia's Deification at Athens," 146.

47 *Ibid*, 147.

48 Lara O'Sullivan. "Marrying Athena: A Note on Clement 'Protrepticus' 4.54." *The Classical Journal*, 103, no. 3 (2008) 298. www.jstor.org/stable/30037964.

49 Raubitschek, "Octavia's Deification at Athens," 147.

50 *Ibid*, 149.

51 O'Sullivan, "Marrying Athena: A Note on Clement 'Protrepticus' 4.54," 298.

52 Walbank, "Pausanias, Octavia and Temple E at Corinth," 370.

given many honours by Augustus, similar to those of Livia's own apotheosis rites, such as coins and statues, she would have only likely have gotten a temple built in her honour upon the will of the people of Corinth, and not by decree of the emperor.[53] Some deification processes are conflicting under a rational analysis of the documentation coming out of antiquity. This is the case when looking at the apotheosis of Claudius, who had a similar funeral to what Augustus was awarded.[54] The Romans mythologized that when Claudius was to be deified, residing already on Olympus, the god Augustus argued that Claudius should not be allowed admittance.[55] In some accounts, Claudius was also voted to be deified before he had even had a funeral which was unusual as then the body being buried was technically that of a god while the previous emperors had been buried and then deified after the funeral.[56] Romans valued an honour known as "triumphator"--derived from the meaning of triumph, its popular definition is one who is awarded the *triumphus* ceremony upon military victory or success in war. This rite, seemingly civil in form, was in truth a religious rite, as those who were awarded this ceremony were "the personation and embodiment of the god Iupitter."[57] Patricians and the Roman patriarchal household were the primary employ of military generals, as Romans believed that status, citizenship, and

53 *Ibid*, 371.

54 Duncan Fishwick. "The Deification of Claudius." *The Classical Quarterly*, 52, no. 1 (2002): 341. www.jstor.org/stable/3556461.

55 *Ibid*.

56 *Ibid*, 342.

57 H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus: An Inquiry Into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. (Brill Archive, 1970) 57.

ancestry ensured privileges in civic and social areas. It was possible to pay your way into a position of power if you were rich and powerful. Therefore, the notion of average individuals like Mark Antony and Claudius being considered a god before their official departure into heaven was possible through triumphator, although Claudius' history suggests this may not have been the case for him, as he technically lacks the military victory required for the honour. By Roman accounts, it was after the funeral for Claudius that Nero suggested his stepfather be deified, and that the senate decreed the process of apotheosis to begin.[58] Nero deified Claudius in the same manner as Augustus, and might have made him holy in the funeral procession, although alternative versions have Agrippina—Claudius' wife—as the driving force behind all the rituals, based on the same tenets her great-grandmother Livia had followed for her husband.[59] There exists a comical myth wherein after Claudius' death he ascends to heaven, however there is an issue regarding whether he has been deified on earth yet, and therefore has trouble with admission.[60] Claudius thus depends on Hercules to bring his case before the other gods of Olympus, since the only temple dedicated to Claudius was in Britain, and as of yet, none had been erected in Rome.[61] As the myth depicts, new gods were given certain gifts that demonstrated their newly gained status, such as statues, a cult following, and a temple.[62] All of these things together were things that only gods could have, the exception being statues. Busts and

58 Fishwick, "The Deification of Claudius," 342.

59 Duncan Fishwick. "The Deification of Claudius," 346.

60 Duncan Fishwick. "Seneca and the Temple of Divus Claudius." *Britannia*, 22 (1991): 138. www.jstor.org/stable/526633.

61 *Ibid*.

62 Fishwick, "The Deification of Claudius," 343.

marble recreations could be made for mortals, but they had to be smaller than life-like, due to conceptualization of the gods as physically huge, immortal anthropomorphic forms, and deserved to be styled as such. However, for one to become a god of the state, there had to be a divine sign and a witness to it.[63] In the case of Caesar, during the games dedicated to him, a comet passed overhead which was understood to be a symbol of Caesar.[64] Even Augustus followed this model; the witness was Livia, Augustus' wife, and was handsomely paid for her role in his apotheosis, but she nevertheless swore to have seen Augustus ascend to heaven.[65] With Augustus' case, writers have emphasized, "the Senate did not *create* Augustus a god but rather recognized that the emperor *was* a god by virtue of having gone to heaven."[66] Does that not spring to mind the paradoxical, unattainable immortality of Hellenic hero-cults? This compliments the idea that some gods can be born as mortals, and that their "deaths" are a repeat apotheosis.[67] It is also emphasized in some of Virgil's writings that Romans believed in a prophecy from Jupiter about Rome's future greatness, and that since Augustus is related to Iulius—and therefore Venus—he was the one prophesied to lead the Romans into an era of peace. The reward for his success was apotheosis.[68]

If the connection between the two cultures, and their methods of apotheosis still eludes the mind, look to the ruins of the temples at Athens and then to the temples at Rome. Magnificent in architecture, both structures are

63 *Ibid*.

64 *Ibid*.

65 *Ibid*.

66 *Ibid*.

67 Radin, "Apotheosis," 45.

68 Bosworth, "Augustus, the Res Gestae and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis," 6.

massive monuments to the belief in an organized religion. In fact, the presence of a religion within these nations was so fundamental, that after thousands of years past the extinction of these ancient empires, religious art, structures, and literature are of the few surviving artifacts of that era. Hellenic Greeks and ancient Romans were nearly identical in their apotheosis processes due to the proximity geographically, as well as their interlocked histories. The truthful distinction, and perhaps the only one worth its weight, is the tendency of the Roman nation to dedicate these pillars to kings, while the Greeks preferred shrines to gods. In summation, although lacking a sympathetical moral sense of personhood upon death, and choosing instead a pragmatic, political approach as opposed to the self-actualization theories of the Greeks, the Roman Imperial cult worked functionally indistinguishable to that of the Hellenic religious tradition. As popular as it is to view the Romans as brutish copycats, their political twist on apotheosis succeeded in what it sought to do: cement a familial dynasty for ages to come, and guarantee power for the many descendants of that god-emperor. Conversely, the systematic worship of gods over men in Hellenic history succeeds in mythologizing an entire people to the degree where legend and reality are borderless. Whichever way the perspective leans, apotheosis was a pipe dream made manifest by the unfaltering will of humanity for the betterment of tomorrow.

Bibliography

Case, Shirley Jackson. "The Origin and Meaning of Greek Hero Cults." The Journal of Religion 2, no. 4 (1922): 441-443. www.jstor.org/stable/1195310.

Connolly, Tim. "Plato: Phaedo," Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, https://www.iep.utm.edu/phaedo/.

Bosworth, Brian. "Augustus, the Res Gestae and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." The Journal of Roman Studies 89 (1999): 1-18. www.jstor.org/stable/300731.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Phaethon, Encyclopaedia Britannica Incorporated, (2020) https://www.britannica.com/topic/Phaethon-Greek-mythology.

Fishwick, Duncan. "Seneca and the Temple of Divus Claudius." Britannia 22 (1991): 137–141. www.jstor.org/stable/526633.

Fishwick, Duncan. "The Deification of Claudius." The Classical Quarterly 52, no. 1 (2002): 341-349. www.jstor.org/stable/3556461.

Grossi, Olindo. "The Forum of Julius Caesar and the Temple of Venus Genetrix." Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 13, (1936): 215–220. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4238590.

Hesiod. Theogony, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1914) http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0020.tlg001.perseus-eng1:1-28.

Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim. Reconstructing the Roman Republic: an Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research. Princeton University Press, 2010, 16-29.

Kreitzer, Larry. "Apotheosis of the Roman Emperor." The Biblical Archaeologist 53, no. 4 (1990): 211–217. www.jstor.org/stable/3210166.

McIntyre, Gwynaeth. "Deification as Consolation: the Divine Children of the Roman Imperial Family." Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte 62, no. 2 (2013) 222–240. www.jstor.org/stable/24433673.

O'Sullivan, Lara. "Marrying Athena: A Note on Clement 'Protrepticus' 4.54." The Classical Journal 103, no. 3 (2008): 295–300. www.jstor.org/stable/30037964.

Plato. Phaedo, Plato in twelve volumes: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus. Translated by Harold North Fowler, Harvard University Press, 1966. https://catalog.perseus.org/catalog/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0059.tlg004.

Phillips, Darryl A. "The Temple of Divus Iulius and the Restoration of the Legislative Assemblies under Augustus." Phoenix 65, no. 3/4 (2011): 371–388. www.jstor.org/stable/41497569.

Radin, Max. “Apotheosis.” The Classical Review 30, no. 2 (1916): 44–46. www.jstor.org/stable/698798.

Ramage, Edwin S. “Augustus’ Treatment of Julius Caesar.” Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte 34, no. 2 (1985): 223–245. www.jstor.org/stable/4435922.

Raubitschek, Antony E. “Octavia’s Deification at Athens.” Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 77 (1946): 146–150. www.jstor.org/stable/283451.

Shadwell, Thomas, Psyche a Tragedy / Written by Tho. Shadwell London. Printed by T.N. for Henry Herringman, 1675. https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/books/psyche-tragedy-written-tho-shadwell/docview/2240971840/se-2?accountid=9894.

Swain, S. C. R. “Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch.” The Journal of Hellenic Studies 110 (1990): 126–145. www.jstor.org/stable/631736.

Thomas, Edmund. “The Cult Statues of the Pantheon.” Journal of Roman Studies 107 (2017): 146–212., doi:10.1017/S0075435817000314.

Versnel, H. S. Triumphus: An Inquiry Into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph. Brill Archive, 1970, 57-66.

Walbank, Mary E. Hoskins. “Pausanias, Octavia and Temple E at Corinth.” The Annual of the British School at Athens 84 (1989): 361–394. www.jstor.org/stable/30104565.

Figures

Figure 1 - Image of Mars, Venus and Divine Julius. From Algiers Relief, Augustan date, Algiers Archaeological museum. Accessed April 2020, https://jcreliefs22.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/nmk.jpg

Figure 2 - Image of Psyche Revived by Cupid's Kiss. From Antonio Canova, Psyche Revived by Cupid's Kiss, 1793, marble, 1.55 m. x 1.68 m., Louvre Museum, Paris. Accessed March 2020 https://www.boutiquesdemusees.fr/uploads/photos/5294/13710_podl.jpg

Figure 3 - Image of Psyche as a goddess with wings. From Ludwig von Hofer, Psyche, marble, 71 cm. Accessed March 2020 http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2017/19th-20th-century-sculpture-l17230/lot.56.html

Figure 4 - Image of Divus Augustus statue. From Egisto Sani, Divus Augustus - II, August 11, 2015, Flickr accessed April 2020
https://www.flickr.com/photos/69716881@N02/22406184808/

Figure 5 - Image of Mars Ultor statue in Capitoline Museum. From Dheinen, Mars Ultor, May 6, 2006, Flickr accessed April 2020 https://www.flickr.com/photos/dheinen/356243190/

Figure 6 - Image of a deified Livia Drusilla, wife of Augustus. Livia Drusilla as Ops, 1st century CE, marble, 253 cm., Louvre Museum, Paris. Accessed April 2020 https://www.heritage-images.com/preview/2674657

Figure 7 - Image of the goddess Demeter. From Ahmet Usta, Demeter / Ceres sculpture, Pinterest accessed April 2020 https://i.pinimg.com/originals/eb/94/69/eb94697a1a57f04243f23b23c3c3691c.jpg

Figure 8 - Image of bust of Livia Drusilla. From Carole Raddato, Bust of Empress Livia Drusilla, March 6, 2014, Ancient History Encyclopedia accessed April 2020 https://www.ancient.eu/image/2349/bust-of-empress-livia-drusilla/

A dupondius, struck for Livia by her son Tiberius, AD 14-37, showing Livia as the veiled goddess Pietas, to indicate her pious character. The Roman Imperial Coinage, cited as RIC, Tiberius, 43. Photo courtesy of the Classical Numismatic Group, CNG.

Figure 9 - Image of coin with Livia as goddess Pietas. Royal Imperial Coinage - Pietas, 14-37 AD, Classical Numismatic Group, Coin Project accessed April 2020 http://coinproject.com/jan/volume1/issue4/volume1-4-1.html

A dupondius showing Livia as Justitia, Justice, struck by Tiberius, AD 14-37. RIC Tiberius 46. Coin photo courtesy of CNG.

Figure 10 - Image of coin with Livia as goddess Justitia. Royal Imperial Coinage - Justitia, 14-37 AD, Classical Numismatic Group, Coin Project accessed April 2020 http://coinproject.com/jan/volume1/issue4/volume1-4-1.html

A dupondius for Livia struck around AD 22 by Tiberius, AD 14-37, showing the Empress as the goddess Salus, 'Good Health'. RIC Tiberius 47. Coin photo courtesy of CNG.

Figure 11 - Image of coin with Livia as goddess Salus. Royal Imperial Coinage - Salus, 14-37 AD, Classical Numismatic Group, Coin Project accessed April 2020 http://coinproject.com/jan/volume1/issue4/volume1-4-1.html

An Apuleius Conversation

Colleen Dunn, Jan 2021

I surely am obsessed with surreptitious circumstance.
Without guilt or shame I used cunning charms to lure his gaze,
wings sprung and talons sharp, owl-like I stalked him as my prey.

Warily I prodded, “Apuleius, are you Lucius?”
Hesitantly Lucius replied with guarded eyes thin grin,
“as if I’d ever tell”. Pure fact is far too dull for him!

Inquiry wouldn’t rest, our shadows duelled upon the wall.
I lay wishing pillow whispers from learned man to me
would satisfy my quest to glean what could or could not be.

“Dear Lucius”, I winked as we reclined squinting in dim light,
“did you spy with nostrils flared on spells uttered in the dark
bewitched by gloomy fumes of sultry Pamphile’s mystic arts?”

“Do we lust for power to transform human to divine,
or simply yearn to flee and fly from tedious mundane?”
If indeed we’re free to choose then perhaps wise men can say.

Apuleius silent while Psyche fought determined dawn,
her rosy fingers released Cupid from the moonlight’s hold.
Resolute I soar alone keeping faith veiled truths unfold.

Kyklos Dreamer

Colleen Dunn, Sept 2020

Be assured that I am most content to rest here.
Such calm sweet slumber in this cool smooth stone repose.
As I recline all tensions drain away,
raising my chin I gaze on marble sky.
Complete and perfect in myself am I.

Disturb me if you must with stares and tender hands.
Your energy and interest shine upon my world.
Within my being secrets I confine,
shoulders relaxed but both strong arms enfold
deep mystery and purpose yet untold.

I choose to never speak to those who prop me up!
Why should a goddess totter on her tortured toes?
With humming of the herds and children's songs
I slumber near the rippling grains and streams.
Fortunate am I to live this lucid dream!

The Legacy of the Emperor Julian

Maya Maayergi

Abstract

This paper assesses how the Emperor Julian is depicted in The Later Roman Empire which was written by the well-known Roman soldier and historian Ammianus Marcellinus. Emperor Julian's reign was one filled with controversy as he ruled at a time when Christianity was on the rise but his personal views were towards polytheism. As a result, his actions and the ways in which he was viewed in the Empire were divided, with his image changing drastically throughout his reign. Marcellinus explores these various opinions of Emperor Julian throughout his work and provides a direct view of what people in the period felt towards their Emperor through a variety of lenses such as politically, militarily, and personally.

The Emperor Julian, born Flavius Claudius Julianus, but commonly known as Julian the Apostate, was a ruler of the Roman Empire from 361-363 AD.[1] Despite having only a relatively short reign as Augustus, Julian had served as Caesar before taking the imperial throne, having been appointed to Caesarship by the emperor Constantius.[2] According to Ammianus Marcellinus's account in *The Later*

1 James Joseph O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire* (New York: HarperCollins, 2008), 152.

2 R. Joseph Hoffmann, tran., Julian's *Against the Galileans* (Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 2004), 11-12.

Roman Empire, Julian's time as both Caesar and Augustus was characterized by a number of significant events, some being positive and some negative. For example, Ammianus chronicles how throughout his lifetime, Julian was faced with a variety of military challenges and emerged victorious on multiple occasions. However, despite Julian's military prowess, he was the center of religious controversy as he supported the traditional polytheistic Roman religion at a time when Christianity was becoming the dominant religion in the Roman Empire. As a result of both his triumphant successes but also unorthodox religious views, this paper will argue that Ammianus Marcellinus in *The Later Roman Empire* describes the legacy of the emperor Julian as one that is mixed and controversial, with people's perception of him and his legacy changing during different points of his lifetime.

Julian was appointed Caesar in the year 355 AD when he was twenty-three years old.[3] At this time, the Roman Empire was facing threats by Germanic tribes in various places, especially in the province of Gaul. This trouble at Gaul is described by Ammianus when he states that the Emperor Constantius "was disturbed by frequent messages about the desperate state of Gaul, which the barbarians were reducing to utter destruction unopposed."[4] Feeling that he needed assistance and "that he could not sustain the burden of such heavy and repeated crises by himself any longer," Constantius appointed his cousin Julian to the rank of Caesar.[5] Throughout his chronicle, Ammianus speaks of Julian's

3 Joseph Vogt, *The Decline of Rome: The Metamorphosis of Ancient Civilization* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1993), 132.

4 Ammianus Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire (A.D. 354-378)*, ed. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, trans. Walter Hamilton (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 80.

5 Ibid., 80-81

exploits as Caesar enthusiastically, constantly praising both his military and personal characteristics. For example, Ammianus speaks of Julian's ability to motivate his troops in a tough battle against the Germanic Alamanni tribe by stating "even this difficulty was overcome by his unfailing energy; he succeeded in inspiring the men with higher hopes of success."[6] Furthermore, Julian was described during the battle of Strasbourg as a person "whose spirit was equal to the gravest dangers."[7] Simply put, "Julian's soldiers loved their commander."[8] These quotations effectively display that Julian's military legacy was one of high distinction and valor, as he was seen as a beloved leader who could boost the morale of his soldiers towards victories for the Roman Empire.

Julian's time as Caesar was marked by a number of important victories for the Roman Empire and he was held in high regard by most members of the army. Although all seemed to be going well for Julian, conflict arose in 359 AD when the Emperor Constantius attempted to recruit troops for an invasion into Persian territory.[9] At this time, soldiers were usually only stationed at one front, so Constantius's request caused an uprising amongst the troops.[10] In February 360 AD, in an attempt to avoid having to move to the Eastern front, the soldiers claimed Julian as Augustus. In his account, Ammianus describes Julian's reaction to this event as being reluctant. Julian addressed the soldiers to try to suppress this movement, urging them to not "spoil

6 Ibid., 91

7 Ibid., 109

8 H. C. Teitler, *The Last Pagan Emperor: Julian the Apostate and the War against Christianity* (Oxford University Press, 2017), 13.

9 Vogt, *The Decline of Rome,* 133.

10 Ibid.

so many happy victories by behaving dishonorably or to let rashness and bad judgement give rise to civil war."[11] But, as the soldiers showed no signs of backing down, "the Caesar was obliged to give way."[12] These quotations display Julian's hesitant acceptance of the title of Augustus. Furthermore, this event highlights the legacy of Julian as being revered, as the soldiers hailing him as Augustus came about due to the allegiance that they felt towards him, stemming from his mild nature, courage, and military success. In addition, this development re-affirmed Julian's character as a man of virtue and loyalty, as he did not encourage this act that would go against the emperor Constantius's rule.

In addition to his ability to inspire his troops, Julian was often celebrated for his strategic and smart battle tactics that led to successful campaigns and is depicted as being merciful to fallen enemies. For example, Julian made the decision to not wait for the usual campaigning season or renewal of supplies in the summer, but to embark earlier in the year with only minimal provisions so as to attack the barbarians unexpectedly.[13] This displays that Julian was regarded as an intelligent military commander, as he considered the options available to him and tried different tactics in order to have successful military campaigns. Furthermore, Ammianus depicts Julian as being humane and merciful to Germanic enemies that had been defeated by the Romans, as Julian told the Alamannic king Suomar "to take heart and set his mind at rest," and granted him peace on the condition that Roman prisoners that had been taken be returned.[14] This furthers the notion that as Caesar,

11 Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire,* 189.

12 Ibid.

13 Ibid., 127

14 Ibid., 130

Julian's legacy was overwhelmingly positive, being seen as an intelligent and forgiving leader.

From another point of view, Ammianus discusses and praises a number of Julian's personal traits that were unrelated to his role as Caesar. Firstly, Julian is described as a man who was exceedingly self-disciplined, who lived frugally, prohibited himself from luxuries and delicacies, "and contented himself with the cheap food of the common soldiers."[15] This characteristic of Julian's is portrayed as a positive by Ammianus, as Julian was seen as a respectable, virtuous, and humble man.[16] Ammianus also details some of the habits that Julian kept such as spending his nights divided between sleep, business, and study. The purpose of doing so was to improve his mind, spend time in prayer, and dedicate himself to important business matters.[17] Ammianus adds that Julian's nights also provided purity and virtue, furthering the idea that these characteristics which Julian exhibited were viewed in a positive manner. In addition, Ammianus provides an account of Julian's attitude towards civil administration, describing how he handled aspects of governance as follows: "When he was setting out on a campaign and many appealed to him to redress their wrongs, he would send them to the provincial governors for a hearing; when he returned he would ask what had happened in each case, and be led by his native mildness to modify the punishments inflicted."[18] This description supports the idea stated earlier that Ammianus depicts Julian as an individual who was both merciful and moderate in his temperament.

Although Julian was exceptionally admired and

15 Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire,* 92.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid., 93

praised during his time as Caesar for his valiance, humane disposition, and many other qualities, after being elevated to the position of emperor, the seemingly unanimous positive perception of Julian began to shift. As Ammianus's account continues into the period of Julian's emperorship, criticisms of his decisions and behaviors begin to surface. For example, Ammianus recounts how Julian sent a letter to the senate in which he described Constantius's flaws and made charges against him.[19] Julian openly blamed Constantius for ruining sacred traditions and laws and criticized Constantius for allowing barbarians to enter the consulship.[20] The reaction to this occurrence in the senate house was not favorable to Julian, as the nobility, in unanimity, said to him "we expect you to show respect to the man who has made you what you are."[21] Ammianus continues by stating "this was a tasteless and irresponsible act on the part of Julian."[22] Another example of Ammianus questioning and reproaching Julian's judgement during emperorship can be seen in his description of the committee that Julian selected to oversee trials. Ammianus comments that "Julian's lack of confidence, or his ignorance of what was fitting, was demonstrated by his choice of Arbitio, an arrogant and incorrigible double-dealer, to preside over these trials."[23] These quotations provide clear evidence that Julian's legacy shifted between his time as Caesar and emperor. While serving as Caesar, Ammianus's narrative rarely, if at all, discusses any faults of Julian. However, once raised to the emperorship, the critiques of Julian in Ammianus's work become more

19 Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire,* 220.

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., 236

frequent, displaying that people's perception of him and his legacy was changing in an unfavorable way.

In addition to being criticized for his administrative decisions as emperor, Ammianus also discusses some character traits of Julian's that he perceived as negative. For example, Ammianus states that Julian "liked the popular applause of the mob, and was excessively eager to be praised for the most trivial reasons."[24] This quotation displays an undesirable trait of Julian's, but also shows a drastic shift in Julian's attitude from his pre-emperorship days. Previously, Julian had been described as a man of humble nature. In fact, shortly after the soldiers hailed Julian as Augustus, Ammianus writes that Julian did not even wear a diadem, an important imperial symbol, as he was so far removed from extravagance.[25] However, after attaining higher status as emperor, Julian became more interested in popularity and undue praise, showing a distinct change in his personal values. In addition, Ammianus criticizes that Julian was too superstitious in religion and that he sacrificed countless victims without regard for his actions.[26] Although the faults of Julian that Ammianus points out are far fewer than the praises which he bestows upon him, it is important to note them and to witness the tendency that Ammianus has to speak more openly of Julian's faults during his years as emperor, as this displays changes in Julian's legacy as a whole.

Although he enjoyed many praises as Caesar, during his emperorship Julian's legacy began changing as his behaviors and choices were not all deemed in a positive manner. Aside from some political and administrative choices which were berated by people like Ammianus, the

24 Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire,* 298.

25 Ibid., 189

26 Ibid., 298

legacy of the Emperor Julian is also considered negatively by some due to the religious beliefs which he held. From his youth, Julian was educated as a Christian and was baptized as an infant.[27] However, he was also learned in the traditional pagan religion and developed a deep appreciation for the work of Homer.[28] Before his appointment as Caesar, Julian and his step-brother Gallus were sent to a secluded region of Cappadocia by Emperor Constantius, as he was highly suspicious of his family members, fearing usurpation.[29] Whilst living in this remote area, Julian had access to the library of the Bishop of Caesarea and was able to spend time furthering his education of both Christian texts, such as the Old and New Testament, and of pagan literature.[30] Although he was raised as a Christian, as he grew older Julian's belief turned more strongly towards the traditional pagan religion. In particular, he worshipped the sun god Helios and considered him to be the supreme deity.[31] According to Ammianus, throughout his career as Caesar, Julian had kept his belief in paganism a secret. But, after his ascension to emperorship, feeling less fearful and able to speak his mind without consequences, "he revealed what was in his heart and directed in plain unvarnished terms that the temples should be opened, sacrifices brought to their altars, and the worship of the old gods restored."[32] Julian's commitment to paganism and to reviving it in the Roman Empire is displayed in various ways, such as through the vast amounts

27 Hoffmann, *Against the Galileans*, 193.

28 Vogt, *The Decline of Rome*, 132.

29 Teitler, *The Last Pagan Emperor,* 9.

30 Ibid.

31 Michael Grant, *The Climax of Rome* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1996), 181.

32 Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire,* 239.

of money that he reserved for the re-establishment of pagan customs like sacrifice or his amending the laws to exempt pagan believers from military service.[33] This open adoption of the traditional religion under Julian's emperorship led to a variety of changes in Roman society. For example, pagan priests and philosophers were the preferred choice for court and office positions, Christians were forced to return pagan monuments that had been seized previously, and pagan Bishops that had been exiled were called back.[34] In addition to these measures, in 362, Julian issued an edict that prohibited Christians from teaching at universities, thereby halting their presence in the academic world.[35] The idea that this edict was despised in Roman society is supported by Ammianus as he describes it as both harsh and an "intolerable grievance."[36] Moreover, Julian's treatment of the Christian population of the Roman Empire garnered him a horrible reputation amongst them. For example, when the people of Nisibis asked Julian for assistance in defending themselves against an incoming Persian invasion, "Julian refused all assistance on the grounds that they were wholly Christianized. He refused to open their temples and shrines, saying he would not help them, receive their ambassador, or indeed even enter the city until he had assurances that they had returned to the old religion."[37] Julian's attack on Christianity was furthered by his imposition of taxes on Christian villages, his ordering of the removal of gold from Church treasuries, and his conscription of clergy members to the military which was a job considered "the most arduous and least rewarding

33 Hoffmann, *Against the Galileans*, 193.

34 Ibid., 193-194.

35 Vogt, *The Decline of Rome,* 135.

36 Marcellinus, *The Later Roman Empire,* 298.

37 Hoffmann, *Against the Galileans*, 194.

in the Empire."[38] As a result of these actions, those in the Roman Empire that embraced Christianity resented Emperor Julian, and according to historian Joseph Vogt, by 363 it was evident that "Julian was not loved by the people."[39] As a result of his reverting of the Roman Empire to paganism and the inferior treatment of Christians within society, Julian's legacy became controversial and associated with negativity by many who believed in Christianity. The Christians of the Roman Empire began to call him Julian the Apostate as a condescending term to express their bitterness towards the emperor. Furthermore, after his death, Christians launched a literary campaign against Julian that affected the legacy that he would be remembered by, as they claimed that Julian had died confessing Christianity.[40]

Throughout his account in *The Later Roman Empire*, Ammianus Marcellinus puts forth different views of Julian during his career, honoring Julian at certain points, and critiquing him at others. While serving as Caesar in his early adulthood, Ammianus depicts Julian's legacy in favorable terms, often recounting his glory and bravery as though he was writing a panegyric on Julian's life. However, as Ammianus's chronicle continues into Julian's reign as emperor, the views which he presents on Julian's legacy shift considerably as he becomes critical of elements of Julian's behavior and judgement. In witnessing this occurrence, it becomes clear that the legacy of the Emperor Julian within Ammianus's work is depicted as one filled with great triumphs and an admirable reputation, yet also widespread controversy regarding religion and disapproval towards his administrative decisions as emperor. Furthermore, it can be

38 Ibid., 195

39 Vogt, *The Decline of Rome*, 136.

40 Teitler, *The Last Pagan Emperor*, 3.

concluded that Julian's legacy, not unlike many figures in history, was dynamic and that perceptions of him throughout his lifetime differed between religious groups, imperial members, and other factions of the society in which he lived.

Bibliography

Grant, Michael. *The Climax of Rome*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1996.

Hoffmann, R. Joseph, ed. and trans. Julian's *Against the Galileans*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 2004.

Marcellinus, Ammianus. *The Later Roman Empire (A.D. 354-378)*. Edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. Translated by Walter Hamilton. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

O'Donnell, James Joseph. *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*. New York: Harper Collins, 2008

Teitler, H. C. *The Last Pagan Emperor: Julian the Apostate and the War against Christianity*. Oxford University Press, 2017.

Vogt, Joseph. *The Decline of Rome: The Metamorphosis of Ancient Civilization.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1993.

On the Study of Spartan Kingship Cults

Kyle Scarlett

Abstract

This paper assesses how the Emperor Julian is depicted in The Later Roman Empire which was written by the well-known Roman soldier and historian Ammianus Marcellinus. Emperor Julian's reign was one filled with controversy as he ruled at a time when Christianity was on the rise but his personal views were towards polytheism. As a result, his actions and the ways in which he was viewed in the Empire were divided, with his image changing drastically throughout his reign. Marcellinus explores these various opinions of Emperor Julian throughout his work and provides a direct view of what people in the period felt towards their Emperor through a variety of lenses such as politically, militarily, and personally.

Scholarly opinion on whether hero cults were established for deceased Spartan kings is one that remains controversial and uncertain. Little direct evidence that supports or refutes the existence of these cults comes to us from our primary sources, and as such many scholars must then turn to other circumstantial evidence to make their argument. This paper will touch upon the primary sources that serve as the fundamental backbone for arguments made both for and against the existence of these cults, before looking at some of the major arguments levied by scholars who either believe in the cults or refute their existence. The purpose is to show that there is no conclusive answer, and

that this topic is one at the forefront of the unknown, leading to the research being continually ongoing.

The most fundamental piece of primary evidence that scholars debate comes from Xenophon's *Lakedaimonion Politeia* in which he writes:

> "As for the honours assigned to the King at his death, the intention of the laws of Lycurgus herein is to show that they have preferred the Kings of the Lacedaemonians in honour not as mere men, but as demigods."[1]

How scholars translate and interpret this passage determines whether they believe in the existence of these cults and remains heavily debated.

Another contemporary piece of evidence comes from Herodotus' histories. Herodotus outlines the procedures that occur when a Spartan king died:

> "when they die, their rights are as follows: Horsemen proclaim their death in all parts of Laconia, and in the city women go about beating on cauldrons. When this happens, two free persons from each house, a man and a woman, are required to wear mourning, or incur heavy penalties if they fail to do so."[2]

This passage does not serve primarily as a point of evidence in arguing for the existence of hero cults dedicated to the Spartan kings, but it invariably is mentioned by scholars when the issue is raised, and different interpretations lead to different arguments.

These two short excerpts from ancient sources serve as the backbone for arguments made in favor of, or against the existence of cults dedicated to Spartan kings after their death. It is apparent that there is scant evidence in the primary written material regarding the supposed existence

1 Xen. Lak. Pol. 15.9.

2 Hdt. 6.58.2

of these cults, a fact which will prove vital when looking at the scholarly opinions that are argued today. Between these two short excerpts, it is the one presented by Xenophon that draws the most attention, and the most arguments, and it is through different interpretations of this line by scholars that formulates these arguments.

One of the first arguments made against the existence of cults dedicated to Spartan kings comes from examining the nature of the Spartan kingship itself. The dual Spartan kings drew their lineage back to twin descendants of Heracles, granting unto them a semi-divine familial link.[3] Belief in the divine right gifted to them by the nature of their birth could be enough for some to argue that cults could be erected on that alone. However, Michael Lipka writes that "one cannot explain the heroization of the Spartan kings by their fictitious descent from the Heraclids. The Spartan king could be removed from office… with his dethronement he lost the right of a 'royal' funeral."[4] He argues that the Spartan kings were not above the law, and evidence has passed down to us that it was possible for them to be stripped of their vested power, such as the case of the Agiad king Pausanias.[5] Thus, Lipka argues that the divine descent of the kings themselves was not enough of a reason to assume the establishment of heroized cults.[6] He also concludes that in the case of individuals being heroized – such as the cases of Orestes, Chilon, and Brasidas – that the establishment of

3 Joseph Roisman. *Ancient Greece from Homer to Alexander: The Evidence*. (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Incorporated, 2011): 95.

4 Michael Lipka. *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution: Introduction. Text. Commentary.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2002): 249.

5 Thuc. 1.134.

6 Michael Lipka, *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution*, 249.

cults dedicated to them was made based on the deeds made in life, rather than the divine nature of the offices they held.[7]

Robert Parker is another scholar who argues that these cults did not exist. In examining Xenophon's description of the honors afforded Spartan kings in their funeral processions, he argues that "though the funeral proves in Xenophon's eyes that the kings have been in a certain sense heroes all along, he does not claim that they continued to be honoured as heroes in the more normal, cultic sense."[8] Parker sees these overly magnificent processions carried out for recently deceased Spartiate kings as the communal understanding of their status, which during their lifetime had been disguised to not serve as a point of pride or envy.[9] Parker does admit that some extraordinary individuals such as Leonidas seem to have been the target of cult worship, but this was not widespread, nor was it inherently expected that all Spartiate kings would be the object of worship.[10]

Another argument made against the existence of these cults concerns the deceased kings' communal burial plots. Parker notes that "the kings were buried in permanent, identifiable monuments which could have served as a focus for continuing cult."[11] However, Pausanias in his *Description of Greece*, written in the second century AD, does not hint at the existence of any cult, only that at the tomb of Leonidas speeches and contests were held each year.[12] Parker likewise sees this as evidence that there were no cults dedicated to the

7 *Ibid*.

8 Robert Parker. "Were Spartan Kings Heroized?" *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 13. No. 1. (January 1988): 10.

9 *Ibid*.

10 *Ibid*.

11 *Ibid*.

12 Paus. 3.14.1.

Spartan kings, instead arguing that the tombs served not as a place of worship in the sense of *ἡρώα* (hero shrines) but as *μνήματα* (memorials).[13]

Thus, some of the major arguments levied against the existence of hero cults in worship of Spartan kings are shown by both Parker and Lipka. To Lipka, the existence of cults is not evident from the sources we have been left with, concluding that the extravagant funeral processions are instead indicative of a repressed understanding of the role that kings played in society.[14] Parker expands on this, arguing that Xenophon was making a "claim about the valuation of the kings which underlies the Lycurgan constitution."[15] Parker also concludes that, from the evidence of Xenophon it is not certain that cults existed for all Spartiate kings, merely that their position in life afforded them a much more prestigious ceremony in death.[16]

Many of the arguments made regarding the existence of cults dedicated to Spartan kings comes from the interpretation of the original Greek written by Xenophon. Bruni Currie argues that the original Greek τώ δείνί τελευτήσαντι τιμάς άπέδωκαν is widely translated as "they paid so-and-so posthumous cult" and concludes that "it is thus likely that Xenophon meant that dead Spartan kings received a continuing hero cult."[17] In looking to bridge the gap presented by the scant contemporary evidence of these cults, Currie tries to show similarity between the kingships

13 Robert Parker. "Were Spartan Kings Heroized?", 10.

14 Lipka, *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution*, 249.

15 *Ibid*.

16 *Ibid*.

17 Bruno Currie. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005): 245.

in Sparta and Cyrene, drawing upon the fact that both interred their royal dynasties in communal plots that were easily recognizable.[18] Currie finds vast similarities between the kingships in Cyrene and Sparta and combined with the translation and interpretation of Xenophon's writings he argues for the existence of these cults.[19]

Expanding upon the argument constructed by Currie, Daniel Ogden argues that even when the Spartan kings had not died as gloriously as Leonidas had, they were still subjected to cult worship.[20] His argument comes from his interpretation of the passage in Xenophon's *Lakedaimonion Politeia*, although Ogden does not present other evidence. Ogden also argues that the magnificent funeral processions were evidence of the fundamental importance of the death of one of the two Spartiate kings; a death he claims would have been felt throughout the community.[21] While Ogden does not provide substantial evidence that the Spartan kings were subject to worship after death, his excerpts show the importance of the singular line from Xenophon, and how that line and the different interpretations of it have formulated arguments both for, and against the supposed existence of these cults.

While Ogden and Currie had little to say in favour of the existence of these cults, Paul Cartledge serves as a vocal supporter. He argues that the kings were "ritually translated

18 *Ibid*.

19 Bruno Currie. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, 245.

20 Daniel Ogden. *A Companion to Greek Religion*. (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 2007): 250.

21 *Ibid*.

from mortal to semi-divine status at death."[22] In refuting the claims levied by Parker, Cartledge refuses to see the funeral process for kings as the realization of their status as heroes, based on the notion that Xenophon does not choose to include a description of the funerary process, despite having many opportunities to do so.[23] Instead, Cartledge proposes that it was through the funerary processes that the Spartan kings were recognized as heroes instead of mortal men.[24]

Cartledge does conclude that outside of his own interpretation of the very controversial Xenophon passage there is scant evidence that directly claims the existence of cults of worship in dedication to Spartan kings.[25] Yet, the absence of direct evidence forces Cartledge to pull upon other circumstantial evidence to help strengthen his argument. Cartledge mentions that there is conclusive evidence of a hero cult dedicated to Chilon, who was not a king of Sparta but was related to both royal houses.[26] He also concludes his article by arguing that "it is hard to believe that none of the many anonymous stone 'hero-reliefs' of Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic date was erected in honour of a dead Spartan king."[27]

While Currie, Ogden, and Cartledge all interpret the textual evidence as being enough to support the notion that these cults did in fact exist, it is once again made clear that in supporting their argument there is a need to pull upon other evidence to strengthen their stance. In the case of Currie

22 Paul Cartledge. "Yes Spartan Kings were Heroized." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 13 (March 1988): 43.

23 Paul Cartledge. "Yes Spartan Kings were Heroized", 43.

24 *Ibid*.

25 *Ibid*.

26 *Ibid*.

27 *Ibid*, 44.

this comes from comparing the royal dynastic situation in both Cyrene and Sparta and concluding on their similarities. For Cartledge this includes mentioning the vast number of anonymous stone-reliefs that existed. How one interprets Xenophon's Lakedaimonion Politeia 15.9 is fundamental to one's belief in whether these cults existed or not, as it serves as our prime piece of textual evidence.

Nicolette Pavlides addresses whether these hero cults existed. No where else is the state of hero cult studies better surmised than by where she notes:

> "Cartledge and Nafissi read a literal meaning of [Xenophon's 15.9] and cite it as proof of the heroization of Spartan kings. Parker interprets the text metaphorically and argues that Spartan kings enjoyed great funeral rites, but not heroization with continuous cult, while Lipka likes to see only exceptional kings, such as Leonidas, heroized."[28]

Pavildes agrees with what has largely been argued up to this point, that scholarly opinion on whether these cults existed comes from one's interpretation of Xenophon's controversial text.

She argues that during their lifetime the kings of Sparta were undoubtedly close to the divine, through both their divine descent and the sacred space that existed in Sparta.[29] Likewise, it is undeniable that during their lifetime the Spartan kings had several privileges in all aspects of state, including social, military, and religious.[30] However, despite

28 Nicolette Pavlides, "Hero-Cult in Archaic and Classical Sparta: A Study of Local Religion" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh), 96.

29 *Ibid*, 98.

30 *Ibid*, 96.

their acknowledged special status, it is not fundamentally clear to Pavlides whether these cults existed in dedication to the kings.

Firstly, Pavlides disagrees largely with the stance taken by Lipka, who in his argument concludes that the Greek passage ὡς ἥρωας from Xenophon is translated to mean that the kings were treated 'not as heroes, but like heroes.'[31] Instead, she argues that in comparing the usage of the Greek ὡς ἥρωας used by Xenophon against other Greek contemporary sources, all evidence indicates "the religious status of the recipient, who should be considered a hero."[32] She concludes by stating that this same inscription is often used to "clarify the status of the recipient and at times to denote the institution of their cult."[33]

However, like all scholars argue the status of these cults, the textual evidence is never enough, and in this case Pavlides turns to the archaeological evidence that we have available. On this she notes that:

> "The archaeological evidence, however, attests to numerous cults through the large number of stone and terracotta reliefs found all over Sparta and beyond, whose recipients remain unknown to us. Although they are taken as heroic reliefs for mythical heroes, given the religious importance of the kings, together with the heroization of other important personalities, such as the ephor Chilon… there is some grounds for thinking that some may have been destined for them."[34]

Like Cartledge, Pavlides argues that while the archaeological

31 *Ibid*, 100.

32 *Ibid*.

33 *Ibid*.

34 *Ibid*, 101.

evidence might not directly support the existence of these cults, there exists – much like in the contemporary textual evidence – a large degree of uncertainty. Pavlides, like Cartledge, concludes that there were many hero shrines established throughout Sparta, as Pausanias says.[35] The future of the scholarly opinion on these cults very well might be decided by new archaeological evidence that might arise, to support the meagre contemporary textual evidence.

This essay has not presented a list of every scholarly opinion regarding Spartan king cults and concluded what each of them believe. Instead, it has taken a sample of scholars who argue for the existence of the cults such as Cartledge, Currie, Ogden, and Pavlides. As well as showing those who have argued against their existence such as Lipka, and Parker. In presenting these views and the evidence that supports each of them it is apparent that the state of scholarly opinion regarding these hero cults is uncertain. The lack of abundant contemporary primary evidence leads scholars to instead focus intently on the one passage from Xenophon, and a description from Herodotus. Xenophon in particular serves as the bedrock for arguments made both for, and against the existence of these cults, depending on how the few important lines are translated and interpreted. In the face of such poor primary evidence, scholars instead turn to other evidence to try and support their arguments, whether through comparing against other Greek city states, or through examining other Spartan figures such as Chilon, Brasidas, or other athletic heroes, each scholar takes a different approach in constructing their argument.

There exists in the scholarly mind then no single answer on whether hero cults were erected to Spartan

35 *Ibid*, 115.

kings after they died. To conclude either for or against their existence one must refute understandable criticisms from the other side and argue their own interpretation of contemporary evidence. Instead, what this essay has shown is that the scholarly field in this area is exciting, and ongoing. Without enough primary evidence to serve as the backbone for arguments, the future instead will look towards the ongoing archaeological studies, which means in ten years time a paper made on this very same subject might look drastically different.

Bibliography

Cartledge, Paul. "Yes, Spartan Kings were Heroized." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 13 (March 1988): 43-44.
Currie, Bruno. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press Incorporated, 2005.

Lipka, Michael. *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution: Introduction. Text. Commentary.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2002.

Odgen, Daniel, ed. *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007.

Parker, Robert. "Were Spartan Kings heroized?" *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 13. No. 1. (January 1988): 9-10.

Pavlides, Nicolette. "Hero-Cult in Archaic and Classical Sparta: A Study of Local Religion." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2011.

Roisman, Joseph. *Ancient Greece from Homer to Alexander: The Evidence*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2011.